

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND EGYPTOLOGY, TRINITY COLLEGE, TORONTO, ONT., CANADA.

IN COLLABORATION WITH JOHN A. MAYNARD, BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
BRYN MAWR, PA.

Volume IX

JANUARY, 1925

Number 1

ZUR DOPPELTEN GENETIVVERBINDUNG IM SUMERISCHEN

Von A. POEBEL, Rostock

In seinem Aufsatz „On the significance of compound postpositions in early Sumerian“, JAOS Vol. 43 pp. 317—322, glaubt Prof. BARTON meinen Nachweis, daß im Sumerischen bei einer doppelten Genetivkonstruktion zwei Genetivelemente unmittelbar nebeneinander stehen, mit der Bemerkung diskreditieren zu können, daß er durch eine von ihm hergestellte neue Übersetzung der sumerischen Königsinschriften veranlaßt worden sei „to study the subject somewhat minutely“ und dabei gefunden habe, daß „POEBEL's explanation does not suit any one of the cases which I (BARTON) have examined“. Daß BARTON zu diesem Resultat kommt, kann allerdings nicht wundernehmen, da nach seinen Worten „POEBEL in his Grammatical Texts, Philadelphia, 1914, p. 24 ff., states that the compound postpositive -ka-ka is a double sign for the genitive—a noun + a noun + a genitive + a genitive“ er offenbar der Ansicht ist, ich hätte das Genetivelement als -ka gefaßt, während ein Blick in meine Grammatical Texts oder in meine sonstigen Veröffentlichungen jedem ohne weiteres zeigen kann, daß ich -ak als sumerisches Genetivelement nachgewiesen habe und daß dementsprechend natürlich auch das doppelte Genetivelement nur -ak-ak und nicht -ka-ka lauten kann. Hätte BARTON dies beachtet, so würde er bei der von ihm vorgenommenen Prüfung der Genetivkonstruktion in den altsumerischen Königsinschriften naturgemäß auch selbst zu befriedigenderen Resultaten haben gelangen können als die sind, zu denen er auf Grund seiner Annahme, daß das Genetivelement in den Formen -ka, -ge, -kam usw. erscheine, gelangt ist. Das sei im folgenden an einigen der Beispiele gezeigt, die BARTON in seinem Aufsatz aus den Königs-

inschriften zitiert.¹ Um unnötige Weitläufigkeiten zu vermeiden, werden die Beispiele gleich in ihre grammatischen Einheiten zergliedert, nicht in der von den Inschriften gebotenen phonetischen Schreibung zitiert. Die Seiten- und Zeilenzahlen beziehen sich auf JAOS Vol. 43, in welchem BARTON's Aufsatz erschienen ist.

S. 317 Z. 15 ff.: Gú-edinn-a(k), -aša(g)-gana-ki-ág-^dNin-Girsu-k-a(k) „das Guedinna (d. i. das Ufergebiet der Steppe), die geliebten Felder und Äcker des Ningirsu“.² Hier liegt nicht, wie BARTON in Z. 14 glaubt, eine Genetivbildung ^dNingirsu-ka mit dem vermeintlichen Genetivelement -ka vor, sondern die Genetivbildung ^dNingirsuk-a(k) mit dem Genetivelement -a(k), während das k von -ka noch mit zu dem Gottesnamen ^dNingirsu(k) gehört. Dieser letztere selbst aber stellt wieder eine Genetivverbindung ^dNin-Girsu-k (< Nin-Girsu-ak) „Herr des Girsu“ dar, so daß wir also in aša(g)-^dNin-Girsu-(a)k-a(k) „Feld des Herrn des Girsu“ nicht, wie BARTON annimmt, eine einfache, sondern eine doppelte Genetivverbindung vor uns haben, in welcher genau so, wie ich das in Grammatical Texts und in sonstigen Veröffentlichungen dargestellt habe, die drei Substantiva und ebenso auch die beiden Genetiv-elemente unmittelbar nebeneinander stehen.³ Die Beziehung der fünf Kompositionselemente dieser doppelten Genetivverbindung möge in ähnlicher Weise, wie ich dies in Grammatical Texts S. 25 getan habe, veranschaulicht werden durch folgendes Arrangement:

¹ BARTON fügt an die oben erwähnte Äußerung noch die Bemerkung an: „As POEBEL (in Grammatical Texts S. 24) cites only hypothetical examples in support of his statement one is at a loss to know on what he bases it“. BARTON hat offenbar übersehen, daß ich bereits im Jahre 1911 in der bekannten französischen Zeitschrift *Babyloniaca* (herausgegeben von VIROLLEAUD), Band IV S. 193—215, eine Arbeit, betitelt „Die Genetivkonstruktion im Sumerischen“, habe erscheinen lassen, in welcher ich aus 152 den sumerischen Königsinschriften entnommenen und in ihrem grammatischen Zusammenhang zitierten Beispielen die Regeln der sumerischen Genetivkonstruktion eruiert habe. Auf diese Arbeit, deren Resultate in Gramm. Texts, Kap. I „The noun-governed complexes in Sumerian“ als bekannt vorausgesetzt und lediglich in dem größeren Zusammenhange der sumerischen Wortkette dargestellt wurden, ist in Gramm. Texts mehrfach hingewiesen worden; vgl. z. B. S. 13, Anm. 1: „For details see my paper ‚Die Genetivkonstruktion im Sumerischen‘, *Babyloniaca* IV, pp. 193—225 under rule 1.“ Wenn hiernach BARTON nicht weiß, worauf sich meine Aufstellungen gründen, so ist das jedenfalls nicht meine Schuld.

² BARTON: „Guedin, the irrigated field which is beloved of Ningirsu.“

³ Siehe meine „Grundzüge der sumerischen Grammatik“ (im folgenden abgekürzt als GSG) § 368.

aša(g)	-	^d Nin	-	Girsu	-	(a)k - a(k)
the field		the lord		Girsu		of of
1		3		5		4 2

oder durch folgende Schachtelung:

aša(g) - [^dNin - Girsu - (a)k] - a(k)

Hinsichtlich der Regeln für die lautlichen Veränderungen des Genetivelementes kann ich hier natürlich nur auf meine GSG § 349—352 verweisen.

S. 318 Z. 36: Abzu-eg-ak-a šu-bi(-n)-IDIM „an den Abzu des Bewässerungsgrabens hat er die Hand angelegt (d. h. *sich vergriffen*)“ (oder ähnlich)⁴, Urukagina, Tontafel III, 11, 12. Hier liegt nicht, wie BARTON annimmt, die vermeintliche Postposition -ka „in“ vor, sondern die bekannte Lokativpostposition -a „in“, „an“, „auf“, während das k zu dem Genetivelement -ak gehört, das mit eg den Genetiv eg-ak „des Bewässerungsgrabens“ bildet.⁵ Abzu-eg-a(k) aber bedeutet nicht, wie BARTON meint, „ruined reservoir“, sondern „Abzu des Bewässerungsgrabens“, d. h. das Abzu genannte Heiligtum, das am Bewässerungsgraben liegt.⁶

S. 318 Z. 39: Giguna-^dNinmah-Tir-kug-ak-ak-a šu bi(-n)-IDIM „an das Gigunû der Ninmah des Heiligen Hains hat er Hand angelegt (d. h. *sich vergriffen*)“.⁷ Auch hier liegt nicht eine Postposition -ka „in“ vor, sondern das Lokativelement -a, vor welchem

⁴ BARTON: „In the ruined reservoir they have shed blood.“

⁵ Der Stamm des bekannten Wortes e „Bewässerungsgraben“ ist eg, dessen g im freien Auslaut abfällt (GSG § 39); der Genetiv aber lautet natürlich (nach GSG § 39) eg-a(k), geschrieben e-ga(-k...). E(g) ist in dem bekannten iku „Bewässerungsgraben“ als Lehnwort auch ins Akkadische übergegangen.

⁶ Vielleicht aber ist e(g) richtiger pluralisch zu fassen und demgemäß abzu-eg-a(k) als „Abzu der Bewässerungsgräben (d. h. der Apsû, von dem die kleinen Bewässerungsgräben ausgehen)“ zu übersetzen; zu dem pluralischen Gebrauch des sächlichen Singulars s. GSG § 132.

In den Inschriften Ur-Nina's, die in einem grammatisch nur tastenden Sumerisch geschrieben sind, wird das Heiligtum als ABZU-E (statt Abzu-eg-a(k) = abzu-e-ga) bezeichnet; vgl. abzu-e mu-dû „den Apsû des Bewässerungsgrabens baute er“, Tafel B V, 6, E IV, 3 usw. Beachte auch Entemena, Türstein F, 34 ff.: „en-ki-lugal-eridu ^{ki}-ra abzu-pà^e-sir-ra mu-na-dû „dem Enki, dem Herrn von Eridu, erbaute er den Apsû des Bewässerungsgrabens“

⁷ BARTON: „In the Gikana (sic!!) of Ninmakh, the grove of the holy one, they have shed blood.“

in diesem Falle das doppelte Genetivelement -ak-ak steht, weil wir es hier mit einer doppelten Genetivverbindung zu tun haben, nicht wie in dem zuletzt behandelten Fall mit einer einfachen. Man beachte, daß das grammatische Gefüge:

Giguna	+	Ninmah	+	Tir-kug	+	ak	+	ak	+	a
the Gigunû		Ninmah		the Holy Grove		of		of		on
2		4		6		5		3		1

genau dem in Grammatical Texts S. 24 gegebenen Gefüge des Schulbeispiels

egal	-	lugal	-	Urim ^{ki}	-	ak	-	ak	-	a
the palace		the king		Ur		of		of		in
2		4		6		5		3		1

entspricht. In beiden Fällen haben wir die Wortfolge Nomen + Nomen + Nomen + Genetivpostposition + Genetivpostposition + dimensionale Postposition.

S. 318 Z. 4 f.: nam-ti(l) - En-temen-ak-a(k)-šû „für das Leben Entemena's“, Entemena, Kegel A, VI, 3. 4. Der Genetiv „Entemenas“ ist im Sumerischen nicht mit BARTON als Entemena-ka, sondern als Entemenak-a(k) gebildet; denn das k von -ka gehört mit zu dem Namen Entemena(k), wie ohne weiteres daraus hervorgeht, daß Alabastertafel, Rs. II, 7—III, 4 in û(d)-b(i)-a Entemenak-e ... ^dNingirsu(k)-ra é-babru-k-animuna(-n)-dû „damals erbaute Entemena dem Ningirsu sein E-babru(-k)“ der Subjektskasus zu Entemena als Entemenak-e gebildet ist. Daß das k zu dem Namen gehört, ergibt sich aber auch aus der Analyse desselben; denn En-temen-a(k) bedeutet „Herr des temennu“, wobei temen-a(k) der regelrecht mit dem Genetivelement -ak gebildete Genetiv von temen ist. Wir haben es also in dem hier besprochenen Beispiel ebenfalls wieder mit einer doppelten Genetivverbindung zu tun. Beachte auch hier das Gefüge:

namti(l)	+	En	+	temen	+	ak	+	a(k)	+	šû
the life		the Lord		the temennu		of		of		for
2		4		6		5		3		1

S. 318 Z. 22: ^dEnlil-la É-adda(-k)-IM.sagg-ak-ani mu-na(-n)-dû „dem Enlil erbaute er sein É-adda des IM.sag (d. h. sein im IM.sag

gelegenes É-adda)⁸, Urukagina, Steintafel III, 7—IV, 1. Die von BARTON hier angenommene Postposition -ni = ana „für“ existiert wirklich nicht im Sumerischen; natürlich liegt hier das Possessivpronomen der 3. Pers. Sing. -ani „sein“ vor (s. GSG § 206). Die zu Enlil gehörige Dativpostposition aber steckt in dem -la von ^dEnlill-la, das aus ^dEnlil-ra mit Angleichung von r an l entstanden ist (s. GSG § 359). Das vor -ani stehende -ak ist das Genetivelement, welches mit im.sag den regelrechten Genetiv im.sag-a(k) bildet; ein Genetivelement -ka liegt also auch in diesem Falle nicht vor.

S. 322 Z. 25 f.: Entemena(k), -isag-Lagašu^{ki}-(a)k, -e, dumu-Enannatum, -isag-Lagašu^{ki}-(a)k, -ak, -e „Entemena, der Fürst von Lagaš, der Sohn Enannatums, des Fürsten von Lagaš“, CLAY, Misc. Inscriptions Nr. 4 I, 3—8. BARTON glaubt hier konstatieren zu können, daß in diesem Beispiel -ge und -ka-ge ohne Unterschied in der Bedeutung der englischen Genetivpräposition „of“ gebraucht seien; er übersieht hierbei vollständig, daß in isag-Lagašu^{ki}-(a)k-e „der Fürst von Lagaš“ (als Subjektskasus)⁹ eine einfache, dagegen in dumu-isag-Lagašu^{ki}-(a)k-ak-e „der Sohn des Fürsten von Lagaš“ (als Subjektskasus)⁹ eine doppelte Genetivverbindung vorliegt und deshalb im ersten Fall das einfache Genetivelement -(a)k, im zweiten aber das doppelte Genetivelement -(a)k-ak steht. Beachte auch hier die Wortfolge des Gefüges:

dumu	-	isag	-	Lagašu ^{ki}	-	(a)k	-	ak	-	e
the son		the prince		Lagaš		of		of		Subjektspostposition
2		4		6		5		3		(1)

S. 320 Z. 1: Ū(d)-b(i)-a Dudu sangu-^dNin-Girsu-(a)k-ak-am „In jenen Tagen war Dudu Oberpriester des Ningirsu“, Entemena, Vase Z. 21. 22. Mir ist direkt unverständlich, wie BARTON überhaupt nur auf die Idee kommen kann, daß die vermeintliche Postposition -kam am Schlusse von Ningirsukakam „at“ bedeute und mit ud-ba, welches nach ihm „that time“ bedeuten soll, zu der Idee ud-ba-... kam „at that time“ zu verbinden sei. Das -kam gehört doch zu der Kette sangu-^dNingirsuk-ak-am und nicht zu dem hiervon durch das Subjekt Dudu getrennten ū-ba, welches für sich schon eine vollständig selbständige und gänzlich abgeschlossene

⁸ BARTON: „For Enlil the house of the father of the loud thunder he built.“

⁹ Zur Subjektspostposition -e siehe GSG § 155, 339, 344 ff.

Kette $\hat{u}(d)$ -b(i)-a „zu (= -a) jener (= bi) Zeit (= $\hat{u}(d)$)“ bildet. Das am von -kam aber ist das identifizierende Element -am „ist“, „war“ (GSG § 193), welches aus a-me, bzw. i-me „ist“, „war“ entstanden ist; das jetzt noch übrig bleibende Nin-girsu-(a)k-ak aber ist, wie schon oben gezeigt, der regelrechte Genetiv von Ningirsu(k), bzw. Nin-Girsu-(a)k. Unerklärlich ist auch, weshalb nach S. 320 Z. 23 in diesem selben Satz $\hat{u}(d)$ -b(i)-a Dudu sangu-^dNingirsuk-ak-am auf Entemena, Backstein A VIII, 8. 9 das -kam plötzlich die Bedeutung „when“ haben soll, statt wie BARTON Z. 1 annimmt, die Bedeutung „at“. Fühlt BARTON hier nicht selbst, daß er sich mit seinen Erklärungen in uferlose Willkür verliert, aber keine grammatische Analyse des Sumerischen gibt?

S. 322 Z. 34: $\hat{u}(d)$ -b(i)-a... Dudu, -sangu-^dNingirsuk-ak-e bád-DA.SILA-Gú-edinn-ak-a(k) mu(-n)-dū „Damals erbaute Dudu, der Oberpriester des Ningirsu, das Kastell (?) DA.SILA des Guedinna“, ¹⁰ CLAY, Misc. Inscriptions Nr. 4, I, 2. 3. Hier liegt nicht, wie BARTON annimmt, eine einfache Genetivpartikel -kage (statt der vermeintlichen Partikel -ge) vor, sondern das erste k gehört, wie wir schon oben mehrmals sahen, mit zum Namen ^dNingirsuk (bzw. zu der Genetivverbindung ^dNin-Girsu-(a)k), während das e von -kage das Subjektselement (GSG § 155, 339, 344) ist, welches anzeigt, daß Dudu, -sangu-^dNingirsuk-a(k) das Subjekt zu dem Verbum mu-n-dū „er baute“ ist. Was dann noch übrig bleibt, ist wieder das Genetiv-element -ak, welches mit ^dNingirsuk den Genetiv ^dNingirsuk-ak „des Ningirsu“ bildet. Beachte auch hier wieder das Gefüge:

sangu	-	“Nin	-	Girsu	-	(a)k	-	ak	-	e
the priest		the lord		Girsu		of		of		Subjektselement
2		4		6		5		3		(1)

Nach diesen Proben ist es, glaube ich, nicht mehr nötig, auch die übrigen von BARTON zitierten Beispiele grammatisch zu analysieren; das Sumerische kennt keine Genetivpartikeln -ka, -ge, -kam oder gar -kage usw., sondern nur die Genetivpostposition -ak! Dafür aber sei hier noch ein prinzipieller, die grammatische Analyse sumerischer Texte betreffender Punkt erwähnt. Prof. BARTON ist ein Anhänger der Theorie, daß das sumerische Schriftsystem durchaus

¹⁰ BARTON zitiert nur bis ^dNingirsukage und übersetzt „At that time his servant Dudu was high priest of Ningirsu“.

ideographischen Charakters sei und glaubt deshalb jedem Keilschriftzeichen einer sumerischen Inschrift einen besonderen Sinnwert zuschreiben zu müssen. Das ist ein großer Irrtum, der sich natürlich auch an seinen Übersetzungs- und grammatischen Analysierungsversuchen rächen muß. Wie ich in meinen früheren Arbeiten nachgewiesen habe, ist auf der Stufe, auf der uns das sumerische Schriftsystem in den Inschriften entgegentritt, dieses trotz der Verwendung von „Ideogrammen“ seinem Grundcharakter nach schon durchaus phonetisch. Ein schlagendes Beispiel hierfür sind die oben angeführten Beispiele der Genetivkonstruktion; denn sie zeigen uns, daß wenigstens soweit die grammatischen Bildungselemente in Betracht kommen, das sumerische Schriftsystem und demzufolge naturgemäß auch die gesprochene sumerische Sprache sich schon nicht mehr um die grammatischen oder etymologischen Grenzen der einzelnen Bestandteile einer Wortkette kümmert, sondern diese Kette nach den Regeln der natürlichen Silbenbildung zerlegt und in dieser Form in der Schrift, bzw. in der gesprochenen Sprache, reproduziert, so daß also beispielsweise statt Giguna-^dNin-mah-Tirkug-ak-ak-a vielmehr gi-gù-na-^dnin-mah-tir-kù-ga-ka-ka (Urukagina, Tontafel, Vs. II, 10—12) geschrieben und gesprochen wird. Daß das gleiche auch in der Schreibung und Artikulierung substantivischer Wortformen (vgl. z. B. obiges gi-gù-na und kù-ga) und vor allem auch in der Schreibung und Artikulierung der verbalen Ketten zu beobachten ist, sei hier, weil nicht zu unserem Thema in direkter Beziehung stehend, nicht weiter berührt.¹¹ Das eben Gesagte muß natürlich berücksichtigt werden, wenn man zu einer richtigen Analyse sumerischer Wortgefüge von der Art der Genetivverbindungen gelangen will. Daß BARTON dies nicht tut, sondern gemäß seiner oben gekennzeichneten Anschauung von dem Charakter des sumerischen Schriftsystems die einzelnen Silben, in welche die sumerischen Schreiber die sumerischen Wortgefüge nach rein lautlichen Gesichtspunkten zerlegt haben, als grammatische Einheiten nimmt, ist letzten Endes der Grund, warum BARTON auch in dem hier besprochenen Versuch, die Genetivkonstruktion zu analysieren, zu keinem stichhaltigen Resultat gelangt ist.

¹¹ Ich verweise auf meine in diesem Jahre im Selbstverlag erscheinenden „Sumerischen Lesestücke“, welche die sumerischen Texte grammatisch zergliedert in Umschrift geben.

THE ANAPHORA OF SAINT GREGORY THE ARMENIAN ¹

Translated by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Trinity College, Toronto

ANAPHORA OF SAINT GREGORY OF ARMENIA

The introduction

MAY his prayer and his blessing be with us for ever and ever.

The thanksgiving

The priest shall say

We praise thee, O Lord; we magnify thee, and we worship thee. Blessed be thy name, and we bless thee. Praised be thy name, and we praise thee. Majestic art thou, with whom our honour does not compare. Thou art mighty. Praised art thou in thy might, and we praise thee, who art on high, and we worship thee. Most wonderful is thy sanctity, beyond measure. Angels adore thee; watchers who sleep not worship thee; and the sixty royal ones who are inapproachable are with thee. The ineffible ones who fly are with thee; and the ineffible ones who go forth from thy presence fear thee; and all the elect join with one voice in glorifying thee. They praise and adore; they magnify thy name. Thy praise thou makest known to men, and thou hast magnified thyself in pity because of thy favour to those who know thee—superiors according to their origin; kingdoms according to their tribes; watchers according to their orders; Cherubim and Seraphim, all of them.

The priest shall say

The holy ones and all their host.

The priest shall say

With one voice we praise and adore thee; we magnify thee with one heart. We believe and we say,

¹ MERCER, MS. Eth. 3, 248 b—253 b.

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord of Sabaoth, the heaven and the earth are wholly full of the holiness of thy glory.

The deacon shall say

Respond.

The priest shall say

Holy, Holy, Holy art thou. The heaven and the earth are indeed full of the holiness of thy glory. O Lord, thou hast vouchsafed to bless us: thou guardest thy holy ones in peril and in temptation. Thou hast revealed thyself to us as our saviour and deliverer.

The intercession

The deacon shall say

Look to the east.

The priest shall say

We praise thee and we bless thee, giver of life and light. Pour thy rich blessings upon us, thy people, and thy holy ones.

The deacon shall say

Let us give heed.

The priest shall say

O God, who art everlasting, thou wast before the last day was decreed and before the heavens were consummated, before day and night were established; thou didst take our flesh and blood and come forth from the womb, and didst descend into the water and wast baptized therein; thou didst become the food of all creatures, which was freely given and didst fulfil all expectation. Three persons were with us. They took all the world as one assembly, as one communion, and as one power, and connected it with the heavenly father. He was made, but not as thou; he suffered, but not as thou. By the power of his word terror is established. He is, indeed, our terror from above; his terror thundereth from the tops of the mountains. Precious is he who dwells above the highest heavens, profound is he who descends into the depths of the abyss, where storm and hunger, accompanied by fire, doth reign in the midst of much smoke. No one shall enter and none shall go out,

except we who are his chosen flock, even those whose two ears and eyes are attentive.

The deacon shall say

For the sake of the blessed.

The priest shall say

O God, the Father, who didst send thine only Son that he might take up his abode in flesh; who was transfigured though not knowing death; confined in the womb though not restrained, living in this world though not limited, who became man though God, he was born though the essence of life, he was nurtured though the source of life; he was exalted in glory though a son, he was supreme in power though subject to punishment, he gave commandment to his family though subject to their care, he submitted to John for his baptism though he was creator, and pure from sin, he was the source of all though he changed water into wine to satisfy the multitude in the field.

The deacon shall say

Respond.

The institution

The priest shall say

Join, O Lord, our humanity with thy divinity, thy greatness with our humility and our humility with thy greatness, that we may offer to thee this sacrifice which thou didst give to thy disciples, saying: "Take, eat, this bread is my body, which was broken for you and given for remission of sins and for eternal life." Likewise over the cup thou didst give to them, saying: "Take, drink, this cup is my blood which was poured out for you and given for the remission of sins and for eternal life. This do as my memorial." And thou didst say to them: "As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do show forth my death and believe in my resurrection, while ye eat thereof, ye make my memorial in praise and in hymns, in an act of thanksgiving and in exultation."

The intercession

We pray thee that thou mayest be to all those who go forth, in grace and in thankfulness, a physician and a helper, a renewer

of body and a healer of soul and spirit. We adore thee with one voice for ever and ever.

The communion

The priest shall say

We present.

The priest shall say

O Lord God of all, thou hast led us to praise and to adore thee, for thou hast given to us grace, purity, and the fount of thy being and of thy godhead. Moreover thou hast prepared thy people, and led us to purity and faith in thee, to knowledge and love of thee, to the end that thou hast revealed thyself to us and to all mankind in the person of thy only begotten Son, Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The priest shall say

The hosts of the angels of the Saviour of the world stand before the Saviour of the world and encompass the Saviour of the world, even the body and blood of the Saviour of the world. And let us come before the face of the Saviour of the world, in whose faith we trust. In Christ we trust.

The inclination

The deacon shall say

Stand.

The priest shall say

Give light eternal upon this, O Jesus Christ, who separated light from darkness. Preserve those who are thine. Lift them up that they may praise thee, and send them forth from thee to help and sustain. Preserve them and bless them, who were made and are nurtured by the holy eucharist, through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

The thanksgiving

Thou hast filled us with the Holy Ghost, and hast confirmed us in the orthodox faith, and hast filled us with a portion of thy love, in truth; and we render praise to thee at all times, through Jesus

Christ, our Lord, through whom, to thee, with him and with the Holy Ghost, be glory and dominion, both now and ever, our Lord and our God.

The deacon shall say

Pray.

The priest shall say

O Lord of all, grant that we may be so cleansed and signed with the sign of the cross that thou mayest sanctify us by the Holy Spirit. Endow us with thy blessing, O Lord, that we may shed a blessing at all times upon all, even as thy only-begotten, to whom, with thee and with the Holy Ghost, be honour and glory, now and ever, world without end. Amen.

Especially, O Lord, bless those who revere and honour thy holy name. Lift them up, O Lord, be with them and sustain them in all adversity. Cleanse their hearts from all sin, through the merits of thy only begotten Son, our Lord and our Saviour and our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, who livest and reignest, God, world without end. Amen.

SOME RECENT BOOKS ON ISLAMIC CULTURE

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, Bryn Mawr College, Pa.

Le pèlerinage à La Mekke. By Gaudefroy-Demombynes. Paris: Geuthner, 1923, pp. 340. Frs. 40.

La cité arabe de Taïf à la veille de l'hégire. By H. Lammens. Beirut, Imprimerie Catholique. Paris: Geuthner, 1922, pp. 215. Frs. 30.

Les Penseurs de l'Islam. Vol. III: *L'exégèse, la tradition, et la jurisprudence.* By Baron Carra de Vaux. Paris: Geuthner, 1923, pp. 423.

La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, d'après les auteurs arabes. By Gaudefroy-Demombynes. Paris: Geuthner, 1923, pp. 306. Frs. 50.

Studies in Tasawwuf. By Khaja Khan. Madras, The Theosophical Publishing House. London: Luzac, 1923, pp. 223.

Introduction à l'étude de la philosophie musulmane. By L. Gauthier. Paris: Leroux, 1923, pp. 135. Frs. 15.

Tausendundeine Nacht in der arabischen Literatur. By E. Littmann. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1923, pp. 37. Swiss Frs. 1.50.

Gaudefroy-Demombynes' book on the pilgrimage to Mecca is the outstanding work on Islam published last year and will certainly remain the authoritative book on the Hajj for many years. The institution of the Hajj was a wiser thing than any one thought in the early days of El Islam. It holds the whole Moslem world together, much more than the Califate, which perhaps will now have to be spiritualized into a democratic and national principle, and anyway has not been really catholic since the days of the Shiah schism.

The author describes the Haram, its limits and boundary stations (*mawaqit*). The Haram has a special *baraka*, and a holy fluid sanctifies every part of it. What grows of itself in it is tabu, but not what man plants or sows. A special tariff covers all breaks of this tabu; that of course leads to much casuistry.

In the second chapter the Kaaba is described, as well as the Black Stone, and the ceremonial washing of the Sacred House. The author tells the story of the many renovations of the Kaaba.

He shows how the rites of touching, the "firm handle" and rubbing the stomach on the navel of the world, probably a part of the floor of the Kaaba, rites which are now obsolete, were survivals of Arabian paganism.

The author gives an excellent study of the various buildings in the court, the kubba of Zemzem, the rite of *siqaya*, and the obsolete *sawîq*. The Zemzem ceremony was apparently an ancient rain making rite, without essential connection with the pilgrimage. One of the court buildings now disappeared was a sundial, *mizân esh shams*. Two kubbas (of Abbas, and of the men attending to the carpets) have also been removed. The kubba of Abbas was used for the *siqaya*, an important communion rite now obsolete. This drinking of sacred wine took place before the *tawâf el ifâdha* (which removed the sacral character of the pilgrim) and was, according to our author, followed by a ritual act of sacred prostitution or of a ceremonial return to sexual life. The *siqaya* seems to have come to an end in the eighth century, an important period in the formation of Islamic practice. The basin of the *siqaya* disappeared only in the eleventh century. The author describes then other buildings of the court, the *maqam Ibrahim* (an old sacrificial stone), the *minbar*, the *hijr*, and the *maqâm* of the orthodox rites. He then describes the holy mosque in its various stages, its gates, arcades, and minarets.

The second part of the book describes the pilgrimage; first the preliminary rites of the traveller, the origin of the *mahmal* as a symbol of the sultan's authority, the character of the Koran it carries and its *baraka*, and the sacrifice of the camel that carried it. Another chapter describes the ceremonies of taking the *ihram* (the first *arkan* of the pilgrimage) and the *talbiya*. The author takes up the *'umrah* ceremonies, which were formerly performed independently of the Hajj in the month of *rajab* and included *tawâf* and *sa'î*. Even in the twelfth century the *'umrah* of *rajab* was the principal festival of the Meccans, although to-day it is obsolete. The author studies these ceremonies and their origin in pre-islamic religion. The Hajj itself was a series of adorations at various sanctuaries and the most important element was *wuquf* (standing) at Arafâ (which is outside the Haram). In the twelfth century this *wuquf* was celebrated in some other mosques of Islam at the time when the "station" at Arafâ took place.

It is quite evident that the Hajj ceremonies are pre-islamic. The prophet performed them in such a way that they emphasized his religious message. By his ritual acts he founded a *sunna*. During the first century and a half of Islam, the evolution of the ceremonies continued until the orthodox doctrines were formed. From the ninth century there has been an endeavor to make the rite less mechanical and to lay stress on intention.

Gaudefroy-Demombynes describes the Haram so well that one could almost see it. His critical study of the *'umrah* and *hajj* is no less remarkable. He should have called attention to a new departure in *ihrām* rites when a notable English convert to Islam was allowed two years ago to wear some kind of a turban. One can never hope that a bibliography of the Hajj can be complete. The author should however have included C. Didier, *Séjour chez le grand chérif de la Mekke*, Paris, 1847, and Hadji Khan, *With the Pilgrims to Mecca*, London, 1905. The name of Wavell is misspelled, and that of Moqaddesi should be of course Maqdisi.

The book would be more easily understood if it were provided with maps and an index, and also with several pictures of the Kaaba and of other sacred places visited in the Hajj.

A book by Father Lammens is always welcome because of the abundance of his documentation. One may perhaps think that his critical method is merely Schmiedel with a vengeance transported into another field, as Casanova's may very well be Schweitzer *in partibus Coranis*. The difference of course is that Schmiedel did honestly try to find pillars for a scientific life of Christ, while the learned Orientalist wants to reduce the pillars of Mohammedanism to a few shaky props that can be destroyed later. This new book on the Arab city of Taif on the eve of the *hijra* continues the *Berceau de l'Islam* as reconstructed by the learned polemist of Beirut. It describes the region of Taif, its fertility, its importance as a health resort, the population and the genealogy of the great families, then the city itself, the religion of the Taqafites, the economic importance of Taif, its political parties, its connections with the Quraish, schools and education, poetry; finally the author tells us of the decline of Taif, explains why the tradition is hostile to that city, and how the Taqafites were the real teachers of the Bedouin, but failed in their task.

Father Lammens does not of course expect every one to agree with him. He apparently disagrees with Nöldeke who maintains

that Mohammed believed in his world mission. We personally do not see how one can interpret otherwise than Nöldeke Kor. 48, 28 and 61, 9. Besides one would naturally expect that Mohammed like the Old Testament writers would have thought of other countries as a mere fringe around his own. It was then quite natural that his religion should spread from the center of the world to these countries.

The Koranic text 49, 4 is quoted by Lammens to prove that Mohammed despised the Bedouin (p. 122). This is not at all the purpose of this Sura, and especially of verses 6 and 11, neither according to the commentators, nor according to the plain literal meaning of the text. One wishes that Lammens who certainly indulges in footnotes which may sometimes be superfluous (p. 134, n. 3) had given us here a few arguments to defend his point of view and not only a rather vague "au dire de."

On p. 11 (123) we are told that Mohammed wanted to be only "the prophet of Hejaz but that the Quraish and Taqafites disguised him into a prophet of mankind." This is the main thesis of the book. It reminds us very much of the theory of some eighteenth century rationalists who claimed that priests invented religion. These Taqafites, unwilling converts of the eleventh hour (p. 127), who were fond of wine and reaped much profit from its sale (p. 146), were well attached to their eponymic ancestor Taqif and did not give him up to the new monotheism without resistance (p. 168). They were not on very good terms with the Hawāzin, their Bedouin neighbors (p. 181). They were closely connected with the south, so that the Yemenite colony was more important in Taif than the Quraish (p. 189). They were indifferent to religion (pp. 193—6), like all the Arabs, and even scorned it (p. 196). The worst enemies of Mohammed in Mecca were Quraish living also in Taif (p. 196). When they became Moslems it was only superficially, and they did not use their influence to serve Islam (pp. 202, 205). Indeed the wealthy Taqafite bankers lost much money because of Mohammed's ruling against lending on interest (p. 212). The triumph of Islam was fatal to their city (p. 274). Politically they were mugwumps, keeping out of the quarrels between Quraish and Ansar, between supporters of Ali and the party of Othman (p. 279). All these statements of Lammens apparently brought up by him to defend his thesis are strong arguments against it.

It is interesting to compare Lammens statements on the immense palmgroves of Okaz (p. 198, 207) with Doughty's description of the same place (*Arabia Deserta* II, 501) as "a seyl bed, of granite grit, with some growth of pleasant herbs and peppermint, and where holes may be digged to the sweet water with the hands." This would scarcely be good water for palm trees, but Doughty was nearly exhausted physically when he passed there and his statements may have to be qualified.

We find apparently a contradiction between the statement made by Lammens that the Christian slaves of Taif were probably from Mesopotamia (p. 199, line 7) and footnote 3 on the same page where the author says that it is fanciful to think that "Addas was from Nineveh." Did not Mosul exist then? Could not Addas have come from that Al-Mauşil where some memory of Nineveh and of Jonah was certainly kept?

On p. 127 Mohammed is said to be in Medina, perfectly satisfied with receiving deputations of Arabs who accepted Islam. Why is this illustrated by Kor. 110 (a late Meccan Sura)? The exegesis of Kor. 5, 66 (70) on p. 158 is far from probable. Instead of the unsavoury leaves of the acacia and the tough growth which takes the place of grass of the desert, we would see in it the fruit trees and the garden crops. The "que" in Kor. 44, 36 as translated is rather weak. *Azim al-qariatain* is not a definite person (p. 214, 223) but more probably a vague term. One knows the lack of historical allusions in the Koran.

Father Lammens is very fond of quoting Tamisier, but Doughty is referred to only once or twice. Is it worth while quoting the work of Roches (p. 131—2) which is plagiarised? Why quote Turpin's old book (p. 143)?

The translations from the Arabic are sometimes startling in their modernity, as "complet" (p. 138) for the word *hullatân*, or "coupons" (p. 212).

The author has quite an argument on the word *ṣuḥb* which means "red"; he would translate it "blond." It is a well known fact that Erythreism is found occasionally among Jews, hence the note on p. 150 is rather unnecessary. "Butter" on p. 155, l. 7, should be "curds." *Ṣabr* is not necessarily "tenacity" (p. 209). The constant use of "Abulkasim" for the prophet of Arabia is, we suspect, meant to be scornful, since Lammens proved to his satis-

faction that there was no Kasim. We wonder whether such an attitude is legitimate in scientific research.

There is a very full index and a list of errata, to which should be added p. 49, ligne 3, lire 106, 2; p. 71, note 1, lire 43, 30. The errata should also be corrected: lines 24 and 25 read "ligne" instead of "note."

In spite of these points where we must disagree with the learned Orientalist, we are one of those who appreciate the immense value of his work. We are all the more willing to overlook the fact that propaganda looms large in it, because, were it not for the missionary spirit, a work of this kind would not have seen the light of day. Our aim in this article is not to criticize the most scholarly work being done on the life of Mohammed but simply to show that some Orientalists less prepared than Father Lammens to deal with the immense amount of material in the *Sira*, are grateful to him for what he is doing for history, although they may not blindly accept his results.

We already reviewed in JSOR 6, 133 the first two volumes of *Les Penseurs de l'Islam* and had nothing but praise for this excellent work. The third volume now published is somewhat inferior in value. Its first chapter treats of the reign of Anushirwan and of his wars with Justinian. The story of Khusru Parviz follows and is told so fully that one would like to see included in a book of this kind meant for European readers the statement that Shirin was a Christian. We constantly need to be reminded of the great importance of Christian work carried on by the Nestorians. Their church is now little more than a name but before it was absorbed by Islam it gave to Eastern culture much of its thought and life.

The next chapter treats of pre-islamic Arabia. Here again facts are not critically presented in their true historical perspective. We are told that 20,000 Christians were burnt alive in a ditch at Nejran. Could not this figure be divided by one hundred? Later the Abyssinian army is said to have numbered 70,000 men. This is also a very high figure, since the Persian army which drove them away numbered 800 men, according to Tabari. Baron Carra de Vaux brings down the South Arabian inscriptions to the second century A. D. This is overcritical. He tells us that Ashtar is the Moon (p. 44), but it was more probably Venus. Certainly it is connected with the Sun goddess as well as with the Moon god. We

are rather surprised to hear that "the commonly accepted opinion is that the Semites originated in Mesopotamia" (p. 48). We hear with some astonishment that the glowing picture of the land of Sheba in Mas'udi *might* be taken from a paraphrase of Kor. 34, 15, *if* one applies here the "critical method" of Lammens. From our point of view it would rather be a *reductio ad absurdum* of the "method," since the great dam of Mareb has been described by two trustworthy explorers and measured, and also since it was the prototype of other dams built in Abyssinia by South Arabian colonists. Besides, the migration of important Yemenite tribes northwards is a most important historical fact which is explained best by desiccation and the destruction of the dam. One notes in the same chapter a certain looseness in the use of sources. Why quote Savary, a rather antiquated author, on the subject of Semitic emigrations in Egypt (p. 53)? That might be allowed in a history of Western Orientalism, certainly not here in a book meant for the general public.

The same looseness of method is found on pp. 55 ff. where the influence of Sabeism on Mohammed is examined. One does not exactly understand what the author's point of view really is and whether he accepts some of the rather fanciful etymologies of Mas'udi and others. Most certainly he cannot believe that the interpretation of *hanif* given by him could go back to the Sabians, since it is based on an Arabic root and not on the Aramaic root which is pejorative. The argument on the etymology of *moslem* is similarly inconclusive. The legend of Abraham in the fire (p. 57) is of course of Jewish, and not of Arabic, origin. The planetary explanation of the sevenfold *tawwaf* around the Kaaba in the 'umrah (p. 59) scarcely holds when we remember that *tawwaf* is performed from *once* to *five* times daily by pious Meccans. Azraqi tells us that Ibn Omar made even seven circuits in the day time and five others at night. Another objection to the astral explanation is that the first three of the seven circuits in the 'umrah or *hajj* are rapid (*ramal*) with the exception of the part between the *yemeni* corners of the Kaaba. We have no evidence that the Sabians were so important that they could arrange and change traditions relating to the important sanctuaries (p. 59). On the question of Umayya bin Abi Salt (p. 66) some critical treatment of pomes ascribed to him should have been attempted before they can be compared to

the Koran. Father Power was apparently too willing to follow the tradition here as his former colleague Father Lammens himself tells us (*Taif* p. 193, 261). The story of Bahira (pp. 71—74) has no more historical value than that of Popess Joan. Besides it leaves unexplained the development of thought found in the Koran and the change of Kibla.

The third chapter gives us the traditional Life of the Prophet Mohammed. In the course of this chapter we are told that Jewish rabbis of Yathrib tried to trap Mohammed with questions on Dhu'lqarnain and the Seven Sleepers. The interesting part however is that the evidence is found in a *Meccan* Sura and that the first legend is not quoted there according to its Jewish form. The second legend is not Jewish. It seems therefore certain that Sura 18 deals with Christian (and not Jewish) controversy. It is interesting to note that Baron Carra de Vaux believes in the "simplisme" of the Semites (p. 93) which Professor Gauthier has so ably disproved as we show below.

The following chapter studies the life of the prophet critically. Lammens' theory is examined at length as it deserves to be. Lammens claims that the *hadith* are usually based on the Koran and have no separate historical value unless they be of independent growth. The author remarks that the traditions which certainly grew from the Koran are relatively unimportant. Lammens claims also that the Koran is full of historical allusions. This is denied by Carra de Vaux who shows that only two battles fought by Mohammed, namely Badr and Hunain, are mentioned, and that even then these words could be translated as common nouns. The name of Mecca is only given twice, that of Yathrib once, that of Taif never. Carra de Vaux shows that Lammens' criticism leads to a conclusion, which he charitably calls a paradox, namely that the followers of Mohammed would have remembered the addresses of the Prophet, and forgotten all his history. We must therefore be ready to admit that many traditions may be authentic. Here and there in this chapter, the author, because it is fashionable to do so, entertains critical hypotheses which are probably out of place in such a work. On p. 130 the names of Abdullah, Aminah and Halimah are called "conventional" in order to cast doubt on the value of traditions bearing on Mohammed's childhood. In that case one might doubt the very existence of Mohammed himself—and

also of Baron Carra de Vaux. Because the names of Khadija and Fatima are rather insulting (Khadija means "abortion of camel" and Fatima "a newly weaned she camel") the author thinks that such names were given because of some opposition to Mohammed which tradition neglected to correct (p. 132). Does he imply that Khadija had had another name before she married Mohammed? Is it not more likely that such a name was given her because a female child was generally unwelcome? The author even casts doubt on the *hijra* itself (pp. 133—134) because the difference of character between Mohammed before it and after it is too sudden. He thinks that it applied at first to Mohammed's death because the root may possibly mean "to die." If this meaning be possible, it certainly is not of much importance. How could the name *mohajir* be explained on the basis of them eaning preferred by the author? It is true that the Hijra is not expressly mentioned in the Koran (p. 133) but this is another proof of the futility of anti-*hadith* criticism. Then the author tells us that one has a right to imagine that there was in Medina before the arrival of the prophet a community of Judeo-Christian character nearly formed; he became its leader and modified the character of it little by little. This new hypothesis is entirely unwarranted. First, the time was too short for a slow modification of this kind. Secondly, Carra de Vaux himself tells us that Mohammed was not very well informed about Christian dogma. In that case his informers would have been also very ignorant and since their Jewish neighbors were really faithful to their religion, the Christian parentage of the hypothetic Judeo-Christian mixture was practically nihil. It is true that Carra de Vaux tells us that the rules of Moslem prayer have their roots in Christian monachism. We fail to see that point. One essential element of *Salat* is ablution, while we know that the Christians were rather opposed to bathing. The use of the *sutra* goes back to ancient Semitic culture and is not Christian. The hours, the attitudes, and the very conception of prayer differ. As for the Ramadan fast, it differs from Christian fasting in that it is unbroken by Sundays, and that the element of denial is entirely absent from it. Rather is it a spiritual exercise, connected with the revelation of the Koran. For one point in common between *salat* and Moslem fast and Christian prayer and fasting, there are scores of differences. We have no rigth to ignore the latter.

Baron Carra de Vaux shows then that Casanova's eschatological theory is not founded on fact. Then he takes up the question of the general authenticity of the Koran, but he soon proceeds to qualify this admission. He thinks that Kor. 32, 24 applies to Christian worship rather than to the work of the *hazan* (very appropriately called *imam* here) and that Kor. 62, 11 applies to Christians leaving the church service for business or sport. This is rather hard on Christianity, but not surprising in the case of the irreligious Bedouin superficially islamized. Kor. 49, 9 (a Medina Sura) is declared late because it mentions war between "plusieurs nations croyantes" a situation impossible in Mohammed's time. Of course, but the text has the *dual* and most certainly the meaning "nations" (given by Kazimirski) is far less likely than that of "two parties." As for as the argument on Sura 110 (p. 156) it is also without foundation, since valid tradition makes it a late Meccan Sura. We then find the view that Mohammed's allusions to the "Mother of the Book" are really to an Arabic translation of the Bible or Gospel to some apocrypha attributed to Abraham. The Koran would be an exhortation to accept a book already revealed. People prayed according to that book, and recited it at night (p. 161). Then this book was forgotten, and the Koran only was remembered, probably because that book was too similar to Bible and Gospel (p. 162). This indeed would be an extraordinary event, entirely without analogy in the history of the world, and the only proof that the author can bring forward is the mention of the "Mother of the Book" interpreted by him to suit the hypothesis. We find further a discussion on the meaning of *qur'an* as "reading" which of course is one of the meanings but not by any means a fundamental one. The author brings in support Sur. 75, 16 which he claims to be a note to the reader, without of course bringing any reason for this theory.

The next chapter is on the conquests of the Califate. The author apparently believes that the Library of Alexandria was burnt by Amru, although he thinks that the fire may have been due to an accident. We thought that this mare's nest story had been exploded long ago, and that everybody knew that the Library had been plundered under Theophilus. However the author gives us as a source Rollin's History written in 1738! The following chapters on the Omeyyads, the science of *hadith*, jurisprudence and the

Commentators are excellent because there the author is unbiassed and did not attempt to present new hypotheses. The high quality of his work renders all the more conspicuous the less valuable parts which we have just criticised with perhaps a superabundance of detail. We decidedly think that untried hypotheses should have no place in a book which is going to be authoritative for many years and generally deserves so to be.

The author's knowledge of the Old Testament is somewhat hazy. We find a loose biblical quotation on p. 54 where the author refers to "the Hebrews and the Arabs" in the Bible as meaning the Hebrews and foreign traders coming with them. We were unable to find any passage of the Hebrew scriptures where these words occur together. If, as we think, the author quotes from memory and means the mixed multitude which followed the Hebrew from Egypt, he has no authority for making them traders or Arabs. On p. 82 we are told that there was "a school of prophets" on Carmel. This is quite possible, but where is the authority for such a statement? Shur in Gen. 25, 18, which is of course the line of fortresses across the isthmus is identified with Tyre. Syria is read erroneously for Assyria, and Havilah is equated with Nubia (which is wrong on the basis of Gen. 2, 11). If the author had investigated the problem of authenticity of *Saj'* discourses (p. 151) with the same problem in Hebrew prophecy he would probably have been less skeptical on its possible authenticity. We do not agree that semantism points to a meaning *innovator* in the word *nebi* (p. 153). On p. 217 Hitti's translation of Beladhori should have been mentioned. On p. 418 the English translations of the Koran by Sale, Palmer, Mohammed Abdul Hakim Khan, and Mohammed Ali should have been mentioned besides that of Rodwell. Possibly Sale's translation might have been coupled with that of Du Ryer, as an antique, but it is still reprinted once in a while. We often wonder why. One should correct *imposa* on p. 133, line 2, and read *épousa*.

The third volume of the *Bibliothèque archéologique et historique*, published by Geuthner for the French administration of Syria, is a book by Gaudefroy-Demombynes on Syria during the Mamelukes. The two volumes of Guy Le Strange on *Palestine under the Moslems* and *Lands of the Eastern Caliphate* utilised only Abulfeda and Ibn Batuta for this period. Gaudefroy-Demombynes adds to these El

Omari, and especially Qalqachandi; he gives a translation of the greater part of the 170 pages of the latter's *Ṣub el 'Ashâ* on Syria. The first part of this section is a geographical description of the country, where Qalqachandi largely used Abulfeda and El Omari. A second section which is not given here lists the various rulers of Syria. A third which is translated, like the first with very full notes, lists the various officials and their separate districts. The interest of the geographical section is largely the quantity of miscellaneous data given by the author, in true Arab fashion. Gaudefroy-Demombynes wrote for the book a very full introduction on the political and administrative organization of the Mameluke state. Most interesting are the pages on the status of the rather shadowy caliph of Cairo who invested the Mameluke sultan after he had been elected or approved by the emirs. Then the sultan confirmed the caliph in his functions. The Mameluke state was semi-feudal. The emirs and the 24,000 soldiers received the income of certain lands and there was a tendency to make this hereditary. This land gift (*iqṭā*) was not a fief but the right to receive the land tax which was of course very heavy. The holder of the *iqṭā* did not reside on his land and if he showed any tendency to treat it as his own possession, it was immediately exchanged. Another difference with European feudalism is that there was no intermediate allegiance of a *jundi* to the emir. The government was really in the power of the administrative offices (*diwân*) whose holders were far superior intellectually to the Mamelukes. Gaudefroy-Demombynes describes the various diwanis, their costumes, the court and household of the sultan and its numerous officers. He shows how during two hundred years the Mameluke aristocracy lived as it were on the margin of Egyptian and Syrian society. There are appendixes on the horse post and the pigeon post, on transportation of snow to Cairo, on fire signals, and on the regular destruction by fire of pasture grounds in the northern districts in order to prevent Mongol invasions. This destruction was often performed with foxes and dogs having burning torches attached to their tails. There are also three indexes. Professor Gaudefroy-Demombynes has given us an excellent piece of work of value not only to the historian but to the student of religion. Those who are certain that Zulqarnein is Alexander will be at least interested to see him credited with the building of Damascus. The author has a long note on the capture of the

crews of Renaud de Chatillon's fleet and shows that their ritual slaughter at Mina is doubtful.

Khaja Khan's work is an attempt to describe the esoteric side of Islam, namely Tasawwuf or Sufism, which is a kind of Theosophy. The author develops its philosophical foundations, the doctrine of essence and reality, the one in the many, emanation, the belief in the *insan-ul-kamil*, annihilation, the future state of man, the five pillars of Islam and their esoteric meaning, the Sufi's ascent and predestination. In the appendixes we find an interesting study of Sufism in the Deccan and a lexicon of technical terms in Tasawwuf. There is a good index and a partial list of errata which should be entered by the reader himself in the body of the book, because they are often misleading. This book is not very critical in its treatment of the Koran, of the *hadith*, and of other pious or poetical sayings but, because it embodies first hand knowledge of Indian Sufism, it will be found very useful by students of this very important phase of Islam. The book is really far better than its often unnecessary quotations of European writers would lead one to think. We know that Herbert Spencer is still fashionable in India but we had not expected to find him quoted in a book on Tasawwuf. Even a student who is not especially convinced as Sufis are that "Knowledge is a great screen" (p. 206) and therefore will miss much of the teaching of the book, will find on nearly every page very interesting data, as for instance, on the comforts of Hell (p. 91), the reality of the future state as a projection of man's thoughts (p. 92), the story of Khidr spiritualized (p. 3—5), the constant number of saints in the world (p. 129). There are a few errors. For instance, Montanus did not teach the Protestant peasants of Cevennes (p. 132); Mount Athos is of course not in Germany (p. 112); but western writers often make mistakes that are just as great.

Professor Léon Gauthier holds the chair of Moslem philosophy at the University of Algiers and is well known for some excellent work he did on Ibn Tufail and Averrhoes. He now edits a public lecture course which he delivered in 1907—1908 on the Moslem philosophers and the religion of Islâm. His manuscript is published as it was written in 1909, without being brought up to date, and that is, we think, a great error. After all, why should books be published? To tell us what the author thought fifteen years ago, or to contribute in the search of truth?

Professor Gauthier knows the *falasifa* very well indeed but he has too great fondness for sweeping generalizations of the Hegelian type. This tendency is not sufficiently checked by a painstaking study of historical data and of the bibliography of the subject. This is rather surprising because R. Basset of the same University has been for years a living example of the way scholars should deal with sources, both primary and secondary.

It is quite evident from Gauthier's book that French orientalism does not easily shake itself from the memory of Renan, whose philology was, like that of Wright among us, vitiated by ignoring cuneiform literature. Of course Gauthier is not the only orientalist who fails to see that, after all, Arabic and Syriac are comparatively modern, and that we have only a very small amount of Hebrew literature, and that of course not very old. But it is really as absurd to ignore Babylonian as it would be for an Indo-European philologist to dismiss Sanskrit with a few polite words. More so, indeed, because cuneiform gives us vowels, not to mention its presenting us with dated documents covering three thousand years, and older than anything we have in Arabic or Syriac. We shall see below how Gauthier dismisses Assyriology out of the field.

Professor Gauthier shows that there is a striking dissimilarity between European and North African Moslem culture and he proposes to investigate the nature of the latter. A race is from his point of view, which is certainly right, not as much a biological entity as a psychological and social complex of feelings, concepts, beliefs, and esthetical, intellectual, religious, moral, and social tendencies. Such a race is perpetrated mainly by sexual reproduction but also by education. It grows by accretion when it attracts by virtue of its superiority and then is able to assimilate the new elements. Here we must dissent from Gauthier. Superiority does not necessarily lead to racial assimilation as we now discover in America. What is more important is sympathy in the assimilating race for the new elements. The Anglo Saxon stock is certainly superior to much of the racial material that it cannot assimilate as well as Latin America does.

Professor Gauthier studies the famous "monotheistic instinct" of the Semitic race as masterfully described by Renan. He qualifies this statement and would only have it that the Semite was *essentially* monotheistic (and not originally so, as Renan said). This monotheistic

tendency is not the primary characteristic of the Semitic race but only a secondary development. Gauthier claims that he interprets here faithfully the thought of Renan himself who declares elsewhere that the most important feature of the Semite was simplicity, absence of complexity, the feeling of an exclusive unity.

Gauthier investigates then whether these words *simplicity, unity*, are acceptable. He shows that these two ideas are often opposite. Politically the Arab seems to prefer anarchy, namely simplicity without unity. It remains to be seen now whether simplicity is also a Semitic feature.

At this point Gauthier examines a book by Lapie on *Les civilisations tunisiennes* where the author studied the racial psychology of Moslems and Jews in the modern city of Tunis. Lapie came to the conclusion that "The Jewish soul is orientated towards the future, the Arab soul towards the past." Lapie was not an orientalist and conveniently ignored history in his investigation. Gauthier tells us that Lapie seems to think that the European follows the *via media* between the anxiety of the Jew for to-morrow and the apathy of the Moslem. This is of course a sweeping generalization and has not even the appearance of truth. Gauthier shows a few of the errors of Lapie, and could easily show more.

Having now cleared the ground, he pursues his own investigation. He begins with a somewhat limping discussion of the Semitic race or groups of languages, which ignores the Hamitic problem. His treatment of Phoenician origins might have been satisfactory thirty years ago. Barton's work on Semitic origins is not mentioned, not the most important work of de Morgan which came since the lectures were written, but should have been taken into consideration. The important data found in the Boghazkoy discoveries are ignored for the same reason, which is not valid for us. The author is very honest in quoting his sources, but is it really necessary to quote Chantepie de la Saussaye's Handbook of History of Religions, now so antiquated, as one's authority on the Phoenician question? After all Algiers is not far from old Carthage and one would expect all University professors in North Africa to be so interested in the mother country of the Carthaginians that they would not make up their mind with Chantepie de la Saussaye!

We find the same lack of proper method in the next paragraphs where Gauthier takes up the Assyro-Babylonian problem. There he

tells us that the Sumerian problem *divides* assyriologists in two camps. We all know of course that he should have written "*divided*," for the question was a dead issue even before Halévy's death. Gauthier adds "while waiting, for the time, no doubt still distant, when assyriologists will be agreed" (on the Sumerian question) the testimony of assyriology is to be left out. This procedure was offhanded, even in 1909, it is scarcely scientific to-day.

Gauthier shows that Arabia was preserved from foreign influences by her isolation and that her people kept pure the Semitic soul while the Jews dispersed in the rest of the world. His argument suffers here from the fact that the Jews of Arabia, in purely Semitic surroundings are not essentially different from other Jews.

Having thus limited the subject of his study, the author tells us that the desert explains the Arab, the violence of his passions and his ordinary apathy; he is a plunderer but given to hospitality, generous and grasping, chivalrous and cruel; he is all extremes, in feelings and ideas. The essential difference between the Aryan and the Semite is that the Aryan loves a harmonious blending, unity in variety, while the Semite loves extremes, and juxtaposition of opposites. This juxtaposition of opposites can be found in religion, history, political and social organization, art, language, dress, and cooking. There Gauthier is at his best; he brings up a number of important data, and presents a valuable contribution to the understanding of Semitic culture which no student can afford to neglect. Most interesting is his critical view of the Arabic art of cooking and serving meals. He has some excellent pages on the spirit of the Arabic language, its lack of harmony, the *multiplicité désordonnée* of its vocabulary, the contrasts in its vowel sounds. His treatment architecture and of poetry, of Islamic government is just as good. He finally shows that the essential aspect of Semitic culture is *separatism*, that of Aryan culture is *fusionism*.

The author studies then this fusionism in Greek philosophy. The main problem of Greek philosophy was cosmological. Plato solved it best by a doctrine of hypostases, which he however abandoned later and which was not adopted by Aristotle. For the latter the first hypostasis (God) and the third (Divine Soul) disappear and the second hypostasis (Divine Intelligence) becomes the absolute. The Stoics preserve only the third hypostasis. Thus did Greek thought evolve a truly fusionist cosmology which would be taken up by

thinkers from the East. Gauthier claims that Hebrew thought was influenced during the sojourn in Egypt by the concept of the Osirian triad, and he now gives us some very weak arguments for the existence of a trinity in Jewish speculation. He is not very well informed on the subject and apparently thinks that Philo represents the true Jewish tradition. As a matter of fact there is much truth in what he says, but it is not very well expressed and should certainly be rewritten in a new edition. It is certainly not true to say that Judaism has anything like a Trinitarian dogma. Did not Gauthier attend a synagogue service and hear the *Shema* so frequently repeated as *the* Faith of Israel, or hear about that noblest of all rabbis, the great Akiba, dying the death of a martyr at the time of the *Shema*, giving back his soul to God on the word *'ehad*.

The third chapter shows how Mohammed attacked the Trinitarian dogma. Gauthier claims with most western orientalists that the Prophet thought that Miriam was the third person of the Trinity. The Koranic text quoted (5, 116) does not say so, but only that Mary was worshipped as a divinity, which of course was practically the custom of many Christians of the time. Besides the Koran mentions elsewhere the Holy Spirit, as Gauthier himself says on the next page, and even if this Spirit is degraded to the rank of an angel; the very fact that Mohammed mentions its name is sufficient to disprove the supposition that he did not know what the Christian doctrine of the Trinity really was. On this point western scholarship has been often uncritical. We find the same characteristic in Gauthier's statement on the Asharite doctrine of the "guarded tablet" (page 104) which as he says himself (pp. 113—114) includes all the decrees of God. The dogma of the eternity of the Koran is, in that case, a mere fact of universal predestination, and the whole discussion on Mohammed's automatic inspiration (pp. 105—106) becomes meaningless. If however the Asharite doctrine is not necessarily koranic, the discussion is left without even a basis. Most certainly also Gauthier who writes in the land of St. Augustine should not tell us that predestination was believed only by a few sects, and is foreign to the Gospel.

In his conclusion the author shows that Islam is separatist, monotheistic, antirationalist, antiliberal, and in its origins, not mystical.

both rationalist and fideist, rationalist when discussing philosophical problems on the philosophical plane, fideist when dealing with the people. Dr. Gauthier has done such a good piece of work in this, and other sections, that one regrets all the more the imperfections that mar other places. We hope that he will soon give us the standard book we need on Islamic philosophy. None is better qualified than he for this task.

Dr. Littmann is publishing a new translation of the Arabian Nights, and is naturally full of his subject. He gives us now an address on the Nights which he delivered before several scholarly assemblies. Dr. Littmann thinks that the story of Aladdin and possibly others were written only after Galland had made his French version, and were influenced by the latter. The collection of Persian (originally Indian) stories which were translated into Arabic at Bagdad *circa* 800 A. D. numbered about one hundred. This collection grew in Bagdad and was taken to Egypt *circa* 1200 and there of course gained by accretion as well as in Syria. It was called the Thousand Stories, this figure meaning only a large number, as when we are told that Shahrazad had collected a thousand books. In Turkish one says *bin bir* (1001) for such a great quantity and the figure 1001 goes back to Turkish influence. The names of the heroes are usually Arabic but many are Persian, and some Turkish. Dr. Littmann shows the Indian and Persian elements in the Nights. There are even, as he says (p. 19) some old Babylonian influences, easily understood at Bagdad. The half animal half man monsters might be from Babylonian lore, as well as the winning of the water of life, and the character of Khidr, the everyyoung, and the story of Haikar. There are also Jewish and Christian elements which came in at Bagdad and in Syria. The story of Sul and Shumul found in the Habicht edition is certainly foreign to the Moslem spirit of the collection. The chivalry romance of Omar ibn en-Nu'mân is of course anti-Christian, but came into the collection as a popular reaction against the Crusaders at the same time as the number 1001. The Egyptians were fond of humor and of marvellous stories; the purely Egyptian stories of the Nights often have this character. Some features of the story of the Second Calender, of the story of Ali Baba and of the travels of Sindbad the sailor can be traced to old Egyptian tales. There are even some European elements although they have been rather

The task of the *falasifa* was then apparently hopeless. It was undertaken by Ibn Rushd (Averrhoes). He and the other *falasifa* are denatured in the case of Miriam the girdle maker and of the princess Husn Miriam in the story of Aladdin Abu-Shamat. The Arabic contribution is the style, the alternation of poetry and prose, some short Bedouin stories (as that of Hatim et-Tai), very different indeed from the ordinary Nights both in content and form. Littmann's pamphlet is throughout very interesting and clearly written.

HEBREW STUDIES SINCE 1918 (INCLUDING BIBLICAL ARAMAIC)

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

ADDITIONAL material on the Hebrew language will be found in the books and articles listed in our other critical bibliographies of O. T. science. This article will be limited to purely philological data. It continues Ackerman's article ATR I, 228—231.

GENERAL (INCLUDING COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY)

143. W. F. Albright. *The principles of Egyptian phonological development*. RT 40, 64—70.
144. E. Ben Yehudah. *The Edomite language*. JPOS I, 113—115.
145. M. A. Canney. *The study of Hebrew*. Int. 15, 324—327.
146. J. B. Chabot. *Choix d'inscriptions de Palmyre traduites et commentées*. Paris, 1922.
147. A. Cuny. *Études prégrammaticales sur le domaine des langues indo-européennes et chamito-sémitiques*. Paris, 1924, p. 515.
148. M. Féghali et A. Cuny. *Du genre grammatical en sémitique*. Paris, Geuthner, 1924, p. 101.
149. J. C. James. *The language of Palestine and adjacent regions*. Rev. (Anonym), CQR 96, 362—363; S. A. Cook, JThS 23, 324—325; Pirazzini, BR 6, 620—626.
150. M. Lambert. *La philologie hébraïque, l'exégèse biblique, l'archéologie palestinienne et l'épigraphie sémitique*. Livre du Centenaire de la Société Asiatique, 1922, p. 105—120.
151. De Lacy O'Leary. *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages*. 1923.
152. R. Ružicka. *Ein Fall des kausativen s-Präfixes im Arabischen*. OLZ 26, 5—7.
153. W. R. Worrell. *Noun classes and polarity in Hamitic and their bearing upon the origin of the Semites*. JPOS I, 15—21.

The field of comparative philology is so exceedingly vast that it should be clearly understood that this section does not pretend

to cover it. ALBRIGHT contributes a most important article which is however largely outside of the Hebrew field proper. BEN YEHUDAH says that the section Prov. 30, 1—31, 9 is in Edomite. CANNEY, a plea for Hebrew. CHABOT reëdits beautifully a number of texts. CUNY studies forms underlying these two groups. JAMES, a survey of the general field. Generally accurate. LAMBERT outlines the contribution of French scholars to the field. DE LACY O'LEARY gives us an excellent Grammar, now the best one in English. RUŽICKA calls attention to a shaphel form in Arabic. WORRELL shows that the law of polarity of Hamitic languages works also in Arabic. SELIGMAN's article (cf. No. 251, p. 53—55) has also a study of the law of polarity. Much philological material in the section on lexicography bears also on comparative philology.

GRAMMAR

a) Textbooks

155. H. Bauer u. P. Leander. *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des A. T.* 1918/19, p. 527. Rev. Baumgartner, DLZ 1922, 400—404; Jirku, OLZ 23, 22—24; Strack, TLB 41, 354—356. Cf. Rudolph, ZAW 40, 148—151.
156. G. Bergsträsser. *Hebräische Grammatik* (Gesenius 29th ed.). Rev. Baumgartner, DLZ 1922, 1047—1049; Caspari, TLB 40, 100—101; Joüon, Bibl. 1, 111—117; Löhr, OLZ 22, 223—224. Cf. Rudolph, ZAW 40, 147—148.
157. — *Hebräische Lesestücke aus dem A. T.* 1920, 1. Heft (Sage u. Geschichte), p. 51. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 24, 167.
158. H. A. Coffey. *Accidence of Hebrew Grammar*. St. Louis, 1918, p. 119. Rev. Mercer, JSOR 3, 49.
159. Blas Goñi y Juan Labayen. *Grammática hebrea teorico-practica con un breve apendice di Arameo biblico*. Pamplona, 1919, p. 312.
160. P. Joüon. *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique*. Rome, 1923, p. 553 and 79 (supplement, *Paradigmes et Index*).
161. W. Lotz. *Hebräische Sprachlehre*. 1920. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 24, 166.
162. E. S. Price. *The elements of Hebrew*. 1922, p. 122.
163. M. Rudolph. *Literatur zur Geschichte der hebräischen Grammatik*. ZAW 40, 143—153.
164. V. Schoenfeld. *Hebrew reader for beginners*. Vol. I, 1920.

165. J. M. P. Smith. *W. R. Harper's Introductory Hebrew Method and Manual*. Chicago, 1921.
166. H. L. Strack. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. 6th ed. 1921. Rev. Bergsträsser, OLZ 26, 279; Laible, TLB 43, 90.
167. Zapletal. *Grammatica linguae hebraicae*. 3rd ed. 1921, p. 168. Rev. Neyrand, Bibl. 3, 457—460.

BAUER and LEANDER are giving a monumental work, which is perhaps marred by a good deal of theorizing on a supposed Ur-Semitisch. BERGSTRÄSSER reëdits Gesenius so as to make it an entirely new work, more critical, but less pedagogical. COFFEY, GOÑI, LOTZ, PRICE, SCHOENFELD write books for beginners. JOÜON gives us a larger grammar, critical, but without wild theories; a work of exceptional value. RUDOLPH writes a historical review of various books with special emphasis on Bergsträsser, Bauer and Kahle. SMITH rewrites Harper's famous method. STRACK's famous handbook. As appendix to his elementary grammar, ZAPLETAL writes on metrics, perhaps too freely.

b) Grammatical Monographs

168. K. Albrecht. *Die sogenannten Sonderbarkeiten des masoretischen Textes*. ZAW 39, 160—169.
169. W. F. Albright. *The Hebrew nippa'el in the light of comparative philology*. JQR 13, 503—505.
170. R. A. Beardslee. *The problem of Hebrew poetry*. BR 4, 124—148.
171. G. Bergsträsser. *Ist das Hebräische eine Mischsprache? Die Vorgeschichte des hebräischen Tempus-Systems*. OLZ 26, 253—260.
172. — *Mitteilungen zur hebräischen Grammatik*. OLZ 261, 477—481.
173. C. F. Burney. *A fresh examination of the current theory of Hebrew tenses*. JThS 20, 200—214.
174. H. Distenfeld. *Was there a form Nippa'el in early Hebrew?* JQR 13, 337—342.
175. I. Eitan. *La répétition de la racine en Hébreu*. JPOS I, 171—186. Rev. Lambert, REJ 73, 221—222.
176. — *Contribution à l'étude du verbe Hébreu*. JPOS I, 42—47.

177. I. Eitan. *Light on the history of the Hebrew verb*. JQR 12, 25—32.
178. G. Furlani. *La nota accusativa eth in Hebraico*. RSO, 8, 213—231.
179. C. Gaenssle. *The Hebrew particle אשר*. 1915. Rev. Bergsträsser, OLZ 22, 120—123.
180. I. Guidi. *Particelle interrogative e negative nelle lingue semitiche*. Vol. of Or. st. p. t. E. G. Browne, p. 175—178.
181. H. Hirschfeld. *The dot in Semitic paleography*. JQR 10, 159—183.
182. E. Hommel. *Untersuchungen zur hebräischen Lautlehre*. I. Teil. *Der Akzent des Hebräischen nach den Zeugnissen der Dialekte und der alten Grammatiker*. 1917. Rev. Perles, OLZ 22, 221—223.
183. J. C. James. *One-tense Semitic*. ET 29, 376—377.
184. A. Jirku. *Zum Briefstil im A. T.* ZAW 39, 146—147.
185. P. Joüon. *L'emploi du participe et du parfait dans l'Ecclésiaste*. Bibl. 2, 225—226.
186. — *Études de morphologie hébraïque*. Bibl. 1, 353—371.
187. — *Exemples de Waw omis dans le texte masorétique*. Bibl. 3, 206—209.
188. — *Notes de syntaxe hébraïque*. Bibl. 2, 223—229.
189. — *Une série de Beth essentiae méconnus*. Bibl. 4, 318—320.
190. — *Locutions hébraïques*. Bibl. 3, 56—74.
191. P. Kahle. *Die überlieferte Aussprache des Hebräischen und die Punktation der Masoreten*. ZAW 39, 230—239.
192. F. T. Kelly. *Some notes on the shewa*. JSOR 4, 82—86.
193. — *Stray notes on the A class segholates*. JSOR 5, 96—99.
194. — *The imperfect with simple waw in Hebrew*. JSOR 39, 1—23.
195. W. Kletzel. *Ani im Munde von Frauen*. OLZ 1918, 1—5.
196. L. Köhler. *Hebräische Gesprächsformen*. ZAW 40, 36—46.
197. — *Die Offenbarungsformel „Fürchte dich nicht“ im A. T.* Schweiz. Theol. Ztg. 36, 33.
198. M. Lambert. *Le sémantisme des voyelles en sémitique*. JA 13, 1919, 360—364.

199. J. A. Montgomery. *Adverbial kulla in Biblical Aramaic and Hebrew*. JAOS 43, 391—395.
200. — *The nominal prefix n in some Hebrew names*. JAOS 43, 50—51.
201. H. S. Nyberg. *Wortbildung mit Präfixen in den semitischen Sprachen*. MO 14, 1920, 177—289.
202. M. Seidel. *Â, an old plural ending of the Hebrew feminine noun*. AJSL 37.
203. A. Vaccari. *Un preteso uso della particella waw*. Bibl. 2, 74—77.
204. A. Ungnad. *Zu den Verben נָצַח*. OLZ 22, 110—111.

ALBRECHT explains the suspended nun. ALBRIGHT examines Eitan's view (cf. 176), compares with cognate languages, and prefers the theory of reduplication of stem of the *n* type. BEARDSLEE explains his idea of metrical translations and gives excellent examples of his way. BERGSTRÄSSER *versus* Bauer. He insists on homogeneity. In the second article he takes up the problem of the weak verb. BURNEY shows the weakness of Barth's theory which rejects the Babylonian permansive as the origin of the Semitic perfect. The permansive as a timeless state has something of the range and usage of the Hebrew perfect; the latter should be called an aorist. DISTENFELD *versus* Eitan. In his first article, EITAN studies various classes of root repetitions. In the second he develops his view of a *nif'al* of the *piel*, or intensive *nif'al*. In the last he develops the claim that the reflexive nun was applicable not only to *kal* in the *niphal* but to *piel* and *poel*. FURLANI compares the use of *eth* with that of cognate languages. GUIDI collects instances mostly in Hebrew and Arabic where a negative becomes an affirmative. HIRSCHFELD distinguishes the dot as disjunctive, diacritical, and grammatical. HOMMEL, on the accent. JAMES, on the origin of *waw* consecutive, is not convincing. JIRKU compares passages in two Kings to Babylonian letters. JOÜON collects instances of *waw* omitted in MT. He shows the syntactic use of participle and future with the same tense value. He makes another special study of this in Ecclesiastes. He has a series of important notes on Hebrew morphology and on various expressions. KAHLE points out some of the imperfections of the Hebrew system. KELLY *versus* Sievers on the medial shewa. In second article, he gives a basis for a classification of A segholates. In the third a very complete classification

of imperfect with simple waw. KLETZEL's statistical study of *Ani* is not based on sound method, and therefore proves nothing. KÖHLER studies the forms of addressing and the expression "Fear not." LAMBERT on the characteristic vowels of the tenses. MONTGOMERY shows that it is probably an adverbial accusative as in Aramaic. In second article he shows that *n* is found in place names of *m*-formation. NYBERG studies the noun formations in *m*, *š*, *h* and aleph. SEIDEL compares with Aramaic. It is not certain whether the ending was originally *ā* or *at*. VACCARI shows that this special use of waw is due only to textual corruption. UNGNAD on the niphāl of verbs doubling the second radical.

LEXICOGRAPHY

a) Dictionaries

- 205. E. Ben Yehudah. *Thesaurus totius hebraeitis*. Vol. 5, fasc. 4—12. Rev. Löw, OLZ 27, 213.
- 206. D. Cassel. *Hebräisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. 1916. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 1918, 86.
- 207. G. H. Dalman. *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*. 2nd ed. 1922. Rev. Perles, OLZ 26, 500—502.
- 208. A. Elmaleh. *Nouveau dictionnaire complet hébreu-français*. 1923.
- 209. W. Gesenius. *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch*. 17th ed. Buhl, 1921, p. 1032.
- 210. E. König. *Hebräisches und aramäisches Wörterbuch zum A. T.* 1922, p. 691.
- 210a. H. Weinheimer. *Hebräisches Wörterbuch in sachlicher Ordnung*. 1918, p. 104. Rev. König, TLZ 44, 123—124; Herrmann, LZB 70, 672; Löhr, OLZ 22, 224.

b) Special Monographs

- 211. W. F. Albright. *The assumed Hebrew stem skt be silent*. SBL 39, 166.
- 212. E. de Witt Burton. *Spirit, soul and flesh*. 1918, p. 214. Rev. Easton, ATR 2, 160—163.
- 213. S. T. Byington. *שש*. JBL 39, 80—81.
- 214. J. H. Bondi. *Zu Sachau*, APO 4, 10. OLZ 1918, 17.

215. M. A. Canney. *The Hebrew* מליץ. *AJSL* 40, 135—137.
216. — *The Hebrew* חמש. *JThS* 24, 175—176.
217. W. Caspari. *Tochter-Ortschaften im A. T.* *ZAW* 39, 174—180.
218. A. Cowley. *A Hittite Word in Hebrew*. *JThS* 21, 326—327.
219. P. Dhorme. *À propos du mot* שלח. *JPOS* 3, 45—48.
220. — *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien*. 1923, p. 183. Reprinted from *RB* 29, 465—506; 30, 374—399 and 516—540; 31, 215—233 and 409—517; 32, 185—212.
221. G. R. Driver. *The meaning of קאר and קפר in Hebrew*. *JTS* 22, 382—383.
222. — *Notes on Hebrew lexicography*. *JTS* 23, 405—410.
223. — *Some Hebrew roots and their meanings*. *JTS* 23, 69—73.
224. I. Eitan. *Studies in Hebrew roots*. *JQR* 14, 31—52.
225. — *Two unknown verbs*. *JBL* 42, 22—28.
226. — *A contribution to Biblical Lexicography*. 1924, p. 75.
227. H. H. Gowen. *Note on* חמר. *ATR* 1, 426—428.
228. — *The color terms of the O. T.* *ATR* 3, 141—151.
229. — *“Sound” terms and “shine” terms (as illustrated in the Hebrew vocabulary)*. *JSOR* 5, 70—80.
230. — *Hebrew trade and trade terms in O. T. times*. *JSOR* 6, 1—17.
231. A. Guillaume. *Some Hebrew roots and their meanings*. *JThS* 24, 318.
232. P. Haupt. *The Hebrew terms for gold and silver*. *JAOS* 43, 116—127.
233. — *Heb. mardut, chastisement and chastity*. *JBL* 39, 156—158.
234. J. Hehn. *צלמית*. *MVAG*, 1917, II, 79—90.
235. A. Jirku. *Der Ursprung des Wortes* שליש. *ZAW* 39, 151—152.
236. P. Joüon. *Ben, fils de, pour petit fils de*. *Bibl.* 4, 317.
237. — *Études de sémantique hébraïque*. *Bibl.* 2, 236—242.
238. — *Locutions hébraïques*. *Bibl.* 3, 53—74.
239. — *Verbe עשק retenir (le bien d'autrui), secondairement “opprimer”*. *Bibl.* 3, 445—447.
240. — *Verbe הונה, pressurer, exploiter quelqu'un*. *Bibl.* 3, 448—449.

241. P. Joüon. *Reconnaissance et remerciement en hébreu biblique*. Bibl. 4, 381—385.
242. E. König. *Eine fragliche Sonderbedeutung von Wort und Zahl für die Auslegung des A. T.* ZAW 1922, 46—68.
243. M. Lambert. *Notes lexicographiques et exégétiques*. REJ 70, 89—92 and 209—213; 72, 210—212.
244. M. Lichtenstein. *Das Wort נפש in der Bibel*. 1920, p. 160. Rev. Caspari, TLB 42, 22—23; Löhr, OLZ 24, 261—262.
245. H. F. Lutz. *The Hebrew word for "to sew."* JAOS 40, 71—72.
246. S. A. B. Mercer. *Words for sin in the O. T.* ATR 2, 234—236.
247. E. Power. *A study of the Hebrew expression "Wide of heart."* Bibl. 1, 59—75.
248. M. Radin. *Teknonymy in the O. T.* HTR 15, 293f.
249. S. Raffaelli. *Two ancient Hebrew weights*. JPOS 1, 22—24.
250. A. K. Sayce. *Origin of the Hebrew Pârâsh*. JTS 24, 175.
251. B. Z. Seligman. *Studies in Semitic kingship*. Bull. of the School of Orient. Stud. 3, 51—68.
252. I. W. Slotki. *A study of רעם*. AJSL 37, 149—155.
253. E. Speiser. *The etymology of ארמון*. JQR 14, 329.
254. D. Yellin. *Some fresh meanings of Hebrew roots*. JPOS 1, 10—14.

ALBRIGHT gets rid of the root by his emendation of Dt. 27, 9. BURTON, a thorough study. BYINGTON criticises de Vogue's rendering in Palmyrene. BONDI *versus* Sachau. CANNEY would translate the word in Gen. 42, 23 not interpreter but advocate, diplomat, intermediary, or go between. In the second article, he finds the meaning bellyshaped bowl in 2 Sam. 4, 6 and Hos. 3, 2. CASPARI, on place names as daughters of a city. COWLEY shows that *šališ* was a title of high distinction (not third). Cf. 235. DHORME shows that in Job, *šelah* means well, tunnel, canal. His book on the metaphorical use of parts of the body is of the greatest value. DRIVER defends in his first article the meaning jackdaw and nightowl. Cf. 231. The second article has some important comparisons with cognate languages. EITAN warns against rash emendations in his first article. The second article studies Job 14, 10 and 31, 23. GOWEN finds in his first article a magical meaning besides to covet. He finds an undeveloped color vocabulary. Sound terms are mimetic and primary. Sound and sight terms go back to a common impression.

Trade terms when they are loan words illustrate civilization. GUILLAUME supplements Driver in JTS 23, 72 (cf. 221). HAUPT studies are remarkably rich in philological comparison. HEHN, a word study. JIRKU same conclusion as Cowley. (Cf. 218). JOÜON compares the use of *ben* to Arabic. His Semantic studies, like those of LAMBERT, are so important that every one should enter them in his own lexicon. KÖNIG *versus* the exaggerated symbolism of words and figures. LICHTENSTEIN, not very thorough. LUTZ compares with Egyptian. POWER would rather translate "easy or untroubled of heart." RADIN would see a use of *kunyah* in some Hebrew names in Ab. RAFFAELI studies *keseḥ*. SAYCE, on the horse. SELIGMAN is important for terms relating to kinship, he compares with cognate languages. SLOTKI compares with Peshitta. SPEISER derives from *ramû*, to cast.

A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PENTATEUCH STUDIES FOR 1918 TO 1923

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa.

THIS bibliography should be used in connection with Ackerman's *Old Testament Bibliography*, ATR 1 (1918) 314—322 of which it is the continuation.

I. GENERAL

a) Text

255. L. Goldschmidt. *Das Fünfbuch Moses, übertragen aus dem Urtext unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der rabbinischen Exegese*. Berlin, Reiss, 1922, p. 201.
256. A. Marx. *Number of letters in the Pentateuch*. JBL 38, 24—29.

b) Versions

257. L. Cheikho. *Deux anciens manuscrits arabes du Pentateuque*. Mashriq 21 (1923) 141—147.
258. A. von Gall. *Der hebräische Pentateuch der Samaritaner*. Rev. E. Tisserant, RB 1921, 616—617.
259. G. Graf. *Die arabische Pentateuchübersetzung in cod. Monac. arab. 234*. BZ 15, 97—115, 193—212, 291—300.
260. J. Mieses. *Textkritische Bemerkungen zu R. Saadja Gaons arabischer Pentateuchübersetzung*. Monatsschrift f. G. u. W. d. Jud. 63 (1919) 269—290.
261. J. F. Rhode. *The Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt*. St. Louis, Herder, 1921, p. 182. Rev. A. Vaccari, Bibl. 4, 232—234.

c) Translations

262. A. Lods, ed. *La Sainte Bible (Bible du Centenaire)*. Gen. Exod. 1—9. Paris, 1916.
263. A. Vaccari, ed. *Il Pentateuco*. Milan, 1923, p. 328. Cf. Dhorme, RB 33, 135.

LODS begins this monumental translation. MARX makes a recount. TISSERANT points to several manuscripts left out by Gall. GRAF shows that this codex was written by a Nestorian of Mesopotamia or Persia and shows the influence of the Nestorian Peshito. MIESES studies Derenbourg's edition. RHODE studies the Melkite Arabic Versions of the Pentateuch in Egypt.

d) History

264. W. Baumgartner. *Ein Kapitel vom hebräischen Erzählungsstil*. Gunkel, Festschrift, 145—157.
265. R. Kittel. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel. I. Band: Palästina in der Urzeit. Das Werden des Volkes. Quellenkunde und Geschichte der Zeit bis zum Tode Josuas*. Gotha, Perthes, 1921.
266. E. König. *Das Ideal der Geschichtsschreibung und Israels Stellung zu ihm*. Museon 34, 89—107.
267. L. Köhler. *Die Personalien des Oktateuchs*. ZAW 40, 20—36.
268. F. Kreskow. *The use of writing for the preservation of ancient Arabic poetry*. Vol. of Or. Stud. pres. t. E. G. Browne, p. 261—268.
269. F. X. Kugler. *Von Moses bis Paulus*. Münster, Aschendorff, 1923, p. 556.
270. C. Meyer. *Jahve und Elohim im Midrasch "Tadše."* Z. Kath. Th. 46 (1922) 330—332.

BAUMGARTNER studies the style of story telling. KITTEL, fourth edition. KÖNIG shows principles and defects. KÖHLER studies relationships. KRESKOW's study of pre-islamic use of writing is important for comparison with O. T. KUGLER's new chronology is based on revised Babylonian synchronisms and astronomical research. Is it always dependable?

e) The Origin of the Alphabet

271. H. Bauer. *Zur Entzifferung der neuentdeckten Sinai-Inschrift und zur Entstehung des semitischen Alphabets*. Halle, Niemeyer, 1918, p. 27. Rev. Herrmann, TLB 39, 304—305.
272. C. R. Bruston. *Les plus anciennes inscriptions cananéennes*. RTPR 3 (1923), 90—94.
273. R. Eisler. *Entdeckung und Entzifferung kenitischer Inschriften aus dem Anfang des 2. Jahrtausends v. Chr. im Kupferminengebiet der Sinaihalbinsel*. BZ 15, 1—8.

274. R. Eisler. *Die kenitischen Weihinschriften der Hyksoszeit im Bergbauggebiet*. Rev. Bruston, RHPR 1, 1921, 555—556; Ranke, OLZ 24, 297—299.
275. — *The Introduction of the Cadmeian Alphabet into the Aegian World in the Light of Ancient Traditions and Recent Discoveries*. JRAS 1923, 35—73, 169—207.
276. — מעשה הכתב ברורו של משה, reprint from *Debir*. p. 23.
277. A. H. Gardiner. *Der ägyptische Ursprung des semitischen Alphabets*. ZDMG 77, 1923, 92—120.
278. J. Herrmann. *Der Ursprung unseres Alphabets nach neuen Forschungen und Funden*. TLB 39, 241—247, 257—262, 297—304.
279. F. Lehmann-Haupt. *Die Herleitung des phönizischen Alphabets*. ZDMG 73, 1919, 51—79.
280. D. D. Luckenbill. *Possible Babylonian Contributions to the so-called Phoenician Alphabet*. AJSL 36, 27—39.
281. F. Petrie. *The alphabet in the XIIth dynasty*. AE 1921, 1—3.
282. A. H. Sayce. *The Origin of the Semitic Alphabet*. JRAS 1920, 297—303.
283. H. Sottas. *Une nouvelle théorie sur l'origine égyptienne de l'alphabet sémitique*. JA 1921, I, 123—131.

BAUER *versus* Sethe and Gardiner. EISLER believes that there was a real Semitic alphabet at the time of the Hyksos and before. In the second article he says that Cadmus belonged to the Hyksos. GARDINER's article translated from JEA 1916. LEHMANN-HAUPT derives from the Egyptian. LUCKENBILL shows that order of letters in Semitic alphabet is influenced by Syllabar A. PETRIE shows that a Mediterranean alphabet, of which the Phoenician is a selection, was in regular use as early as the twelfth dynasty. SOTTAS, on Gardiner, which he does not follow.

f) Connection with Egypt

284. G. A. F. Knight. *Nile and Jordan*. London, Clark, 1921, p. 583. Rev. S. A. Cook, JTS 23, 325—326 and PEFQS 1921, 146—147; Kyle, BS 79, 383—392; Paton, AJSL 39, 148—152; J. M. P. Smith, JR 1, 653—655; Hoschander, JQR 15, 123—132.

285. A. Moret et G. Davy. *Des clans aux empires. L'organisation sociale et les développements dans l'Orient Ancien*. Paris, Renaissance du Livre, 1923, p. 540.
286. D. Paton. *The annals of Thutmosis III (Early Egyptian Records of Travels)*. Vol. III, 1918; Vol. IV, 1922.
287. T. E. Peet. *Egypt and the O. T.* 1923. Rev. (Petrie), AE 1923, 85—86; Luzac's Orient. List, 34, 45—46; Synave, RSPT 13, 101—102; Wreszinski, OLZ 27, 14—20.

KNIGHT's work is bulky and uncritical. MORET studies origin of social organization to the Empire. The point of view is excellent so far as Egypt is concerned. PATON, important for geography. PEET is cautious and well balanced, the best recent work on the subject. Good study of Abraham and of Exodus. Cf. also Kyle, 301.

g) The critical Position

288. E. S. Brightman. *The sources of the Hexateuch. J, E and P in the text of the American Standard Edition according to the Consensus of scholarship*. New York, Abingdon Press, 1918, p. 395. Rev. Ackerman, ATR I, 345—347; McFadyen, ET 34, 326—328; J. M. P. Smith, JTh 23, 125—126; Wiener, BS 1918, 594—598.
289. O. Eissfeldt. *Hexateuch Synopse*. 1922. Rev. Allis, PTR 21, 473—476; Lofthouse, London Quart. Rev. July 1923, 100—102; Skinner, JTh 24, 433—440; J. M. P. Smith, AJSL 39, 291—292; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 110—111; Holzinger, DLZ 1924, 482—485.
290. P. Humbert. *In memoriam Wellhausen*. RTP 6, 1918, 58—64.
291. J. Nikel. *Die Pentateuchfrage*. Münster, 1921, p. 83. Rev. RB, 1922, 150—151; Synave, RSPT 11, 130—131; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 114.
292. M. Touzard. *Moïse et Josué*. Dict. apolog. d. l. foi cathol. Paris, 1919. Fasc. 15, col. 695—860. Rev. Desnoyers, BLE 1920, 150—151; Kissane, IQR 15, 67—70; 271—272; Synave, RSPT 9, 222—226. Cf. also Fernandez, 299.
293. — *Moïse et le Pentateuque*. Rev. du Clergé français 99 (Sept. 1919) 321—343.

BRIGHTMAN, a good instrument of work. EISSFELDT calls L the older strata of J, which shows less influence of the prophetic and priestly spirit. The documents are printed in parallel columns.

L and E are nomadic (due here to eighth century revival) and J agricultural. HUMBERT calls attention to Wellhausen's real piety, so well expressed by himself in *Israelit. u. jüd. Geschichte*, p. 386. Cf. Jülicher, *Christliche Welt*, 1918, p. 74. NIKEL expresses a modern point of view carefully guarded in the dogmatic sphere. TOUZARD was less careful in his theory of four secretaries of Moses which was attacked by FERNANDEZ (299) and others and condemned by ecclesiastical authority.

h) The conservative Reaction

294. R. E. Bird. *The Mosaic Law*, in "*The Religion of the Scriptures*," ed. C. Lattery, Cambridge, Heffer, 1921.
295. J. Calès. *L'authenticité mosaïque du Pentateuque et la valeur historique de l'Hexateuque d'après une étude récente*. Rech. Sc. Rel. 11, 1920, 102—116.
296. D. Devimeux. *Essai sur les procédés littéraires dont il paraît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse*. Fasc. I. Paris, Geuthner, 1923.
297. W. Ewing. *The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Higher Criticism*. Exp. 1919, 18, 451—469.
298. — *The Samaritans and their Sacred Law. The Antiquity of the Five Books of Moses*. BS 79, 418—451.
299. A. Fernandez. *La critica reciente y el Pentateuco*. Bibl. I, 173—210; 376—378.
300. Hoepfl. *Pentateuque et Hexateuque*. Dict. apol. d. l. foi cathol.
301. M. G. Kyle. *Moses and the Monuments, Light from Archaeology on Pentateuchal Times*. 1920, p. 290. Rev. RB, 1921, 471; Robinson, BS 77, 1918, 345—355; Synave, RSPT 11, 153; Mercer, ATR 3, 239—241.
302. — *The problem of the Pentateuch*. 1920, p. 311. Rev. BR 6, 476—480; Keyser, BS, 1921, 103—109; Mercer, ATR 4, 84—85.
303. — *A new Solution of the Pentateuchal Problem*. BS, 1918, 31—69; 195—212; with *Observations* by Wiener, 451—456.
304. J. W. Lightly, *The Samaritans and the Pentateuch*. London Quart. Rev. 1920, 250—253.
305. J. E. H. Thompson. *The Samaritans*. 1919, p. 450. Rev. Barnes, JThS 21, 283; Kennedy, ET 31, 374—375; Robinson, BS 77, 355—358; Wilson, BR 136—143.

306. J. E. H. Thompson. *The Samaritan Pentateuch, its Date and Origin*. BS 6, 72—93.
307. G. Vigouroux. *Manuel biblique, Anc. Test. Tome I. Introd. Gener. Pentateuque*. Paris, 1917, p. 603, 14 ed. rev. by A. Brassac and J. Ducher. Cf. Synave, RSPT 9, 212—213.
308. H. M. Wiener. *Some Factors in early Hebrew History*. BS, 1921, 201—231; 377 ff.
309. — *Contribution to a new Theory of the Composition of the Pentateuch*. BS, 1918, 80—103; 237—266; 1919, 193—220; 1920, 305—328, 368—403.
310. — *The present position of the pentateuchal question*. NKS, 1924, 70—76.

BIRD defends Mosaic authorship. CALÈS studies Touzard. DEVIMEUX studies Gen. 1—9 and defends unity with a "strophic" theory of poetry. FERNANDEZ defends the decision of the (Papal) Biblical Commission with great scholarship. HOEPFL's article in *Introductio specialis in Libros Veteris Testamenti*, 1921 reprinted in place of Touzard's. In his book on Moses, KYLE finds that the tabernacle, sacrifice, the idea of resurrection show Egyptian influence. In his work on the Pentateuch, he analyzes the contents in sections which nearly coincide with the usual distinction between J, E, D, P. These are here explained on internal ground as pure literary phenomena, the different kinds of laws (judgments, statutes, commandments) being technical words demanded special literary forms. In his article, he endorsed Naville's theory (p. 203). THOMPSON's work is an apology for the Mosaic authenticity of the Pentateuch. EWING and WILSON praise it as fatal to criticism. LIGHTLY and BARNES show its weakness. WIENER says that the Pentateuch was written on skins which were damaged and disarranged. His method of textual criticism remains rash. Cf. No. 347. The third article tries to utilize Löhr's theory (334) on behalf of conservatism. Cf. also Wilson, 573 and Wiener, 584.

i) Naville's Theory and its Criticism

311. A. Naville. *La composition et les sources de la Genèse*. RHR 78, 1918, 1—38; abstract in English, BS 1919, 234—243.
312. — *L'évolution de la langue égyptienne et les langues sémitiques*. Paris, Geuthner, 1920. Rev. Allen, AJSL 38, 151; Jéquier, RTP 9, 165—168; Maynard, JSOR 6, 34—35.

313. A. Naville. *The historical method in the study of the O. T.* PTR, 1924, 353—376.
314. — *La haute critique dans le Pentateuque.* Neuchâtel, 1921, p. 93. Rev. Maynard, ATR 5, 145—146; Podechard, RSR 3, 375—378.
315. — *The higher criticism in relation to the Pentateuch.* New York, Scribners, 1923, p. 192. Rev. Robinson, Exp. 26, 467—470.
316. — *La loi de Moïse.* RTP 8, 176—223.
317. — *The Law of Moses.* London, Thynne, 1922, p. 78.
318. — *The seventeenth chapter of Genesis.* ET 33, 127—130, and 35, 29—30.
319. A. Causse. *Une campagne pour la mosaïcité du Pentateuque.* RHPR 1, 1921, 259—264.
320. C. M. Cobern. *Archeological Discoveries and the O. T.* BR 3, 1918, 9—38.
321. E. Doumergue. *Moïse et la Genèse d'après les travaux de M. le professeur Edouard Naville.* P. 137. Rev. Maynard, ATR 3, 239; Synave, RSPT 11, 152—153; Wiener, BS, 1921, 110—113.
322. P. Humbert. *M. Edouard Naville et la critique du Pentateuque.* RTP 9, 1921, 59—92.
323. C. Jaeger. *La théorie linguistique de M. Edouard Naville.* RHPR 1, 265—268.
324. E. König. *Neuer Aufschluß über die Quellen der Genesis?* ARW 21, 1922, 340—359.
325. J. A. Maynard. *Hebrew or Akkadian.* ATR 3, 284—299.
326. — *Hebrew or Aramaic.* ATR 4, 29—45.
327. J. Offord. *The Alphabet of the Hebrew Bible.* PEFQS, 1918, 180—181.
328. S. Ronzevalle. *La langue primitive de la Bible.* Rech. S. R. 12, 233—234.
329. A. H. Sayce. *The latest results of O. T. archeology.* ET 33, 37—39.
330. — *Naville on the Pentateuch.* ET 33, 458.
331. K. Smoroński. *Język i pismo pierwotne Pentateuchu.* Przegląd Teologiczny, 1923, 177—194. Cf. RSPT 13, 132.

NAVILLE combines a theory which is entirely destructive to the credibility of the Old Testament with a conviction that Moses

wrote the Pentateuch. In the last article he explains El Shaddai as being, not a name of God, but a title denoting possession. In his article DOUMERGUE endorses Naville's thesis. It is rejected by PODECHARD, SYNAVE, CAUSSE, COBERN, WIENER, HUMBERT, JAEGER, KÖNIG, MAYNARD, RONZEVALLE, SAYCE, SMOROŃSKI. In his second article, SAYCE finds that Humbert's article is not very convincing. OFFORD approves Sidersky's view that certain textual errors come from transcribing a text from Samaritan script into Aramaic characters.

II. GENESIS

a) General

332. J. Cooper. *O. T. Preparations for the Catholic Church. The Book of Genesis*. CQ 9, 1921, 558—577.
333. E. König. *Die Genesis, eingeleitet, übersetzt und erklärt*. 1919, p. 792. Rev. Baumgartner, DLZ, 1922, 739—742; Caspari, TLB 40, 419—421; Murillo, Bibl. I, 396—402; Gruber, BS 77, 460—465.
334. M. Löhr. *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem. Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis*. 1924, p. 32.
335. S. A. B. Mercer. *The Book of Genesis for Bible Classes and private Study*. Milwaukee, Morehouse, 1919. Rev. Matthews, JSOR 4, 46—47; Maynard, ATR II, 334—336; Pinches, JRAS, 1921, 267—268.
336. J. Morgenstern. *A Jewish Interpretation of the Book of Genesis*. 1919, p. 346. Rev. Matthews, JSOR 4, 47—49; Mercer, ATR 3, 84; J. M. P. Smith, AJSL 37, 159.
337. J. Paterson Smyth. *The Book of Genesis* (in the Bible for School and Home). New York, Doran, 1922, p. 196.
338. W. Stärk. *Zur alttest. Literarkritik. Grundsätzliches und Methodisches*. ZAW 42, 34—73.

KÖNIG's book is of fundamental value. LÖHR rejects entirely critical reconstruction of P in Genesis. MERCER, a thorough method of study. MORGENSTERN excellent for advanced students of the Bible. SMYTH, more elementary work. Cf. also Böhl, 348. STÄRK studies sources of Gen. 1—11 and 15.

b) Text

339. F. Field. *Dr. Field's O. T. Revision Notes*. ET 30, 85—86; 181—182.

340. G. Hoberg. *Liber Geneseos. Textum Hebraicum emendavit Latinum vulgatum addidit.* Cf. Barnes, JThD 23, 84.
 341. E. E. Kellett. *Some O. T. notes and queries.* ET 33, 426.
 342. M. Lambert. *Notes lexicographiques et exégétiques.* REJ 72, 89—91; 73, 212—214.
 343. J. Meinhold. *Textkonjekturen.* ZAW 38, 169—170.

FIELD's notes on several verses of Genesis, on which he based his work on RV, now published. HOBERG removes a few *cruces*. KELLETT emends text in Gen. 6 and 49. LAMBERT emends text in Gen. 7, 20; 16, 14; 30, 17. MEINHOLD emends text in Gen. 49.

c) Versions

344. H. S. Davidson. *De Lagardes Ausgabe der arabischen Übersetzung der Genesis (cod. Leid. arab. 230) nachgeprüft.* Leip. Sem. St. 3, 5, 1919, p. 35. Rev. OLZ 26, 119—121.
 345. G. de Jerphanion. *Une variante isolée d'un manuscrit confirmée par l'épigraphie.* Bibl. 3, 444—445.
 346. S. T. Olmstead. *The Greek Genesis.* AJSL. 34, 145—169.
 347. H. M. Wiener. *The Greek Genesis, the Graf Wellhausen Theory, and the conservative Position.* BS, 1918, 41—60.

DAVIDSON — corrections. DE JERPHANION, on a variant of Ms. 130 (of the LXX) in Gen. 22, 12, explained by a Christian picture in a Cappadocian chapel. OLMSTEAD studies families of Greek texts. WIENER takes up this article and shows that it tends to discredit the documentary theory.

d) Translations

348. F. M. Th. Böhl. *Genesis.* Gronigen, 1923, p. 160. Rev. S. A. Cook, JTS 97, 103—104; Dhorme, RB 33, 135—136; Mercer, JSOR 8, 40; Sellin, Theol. d. Geg. 17, 109; Rudolph, TLZ 49, 54.
 349. T. H. Robinson. *The Book of Genesis* (National Adult School Union). 1922.

BÖHL, excellent translation of Gen. 1—25, 18, with commentary bringing out Babylonian similarities. ROBINSON, translation in colloquial English at a popular price.

e) The first eleven Chapters

350. W. F. Albright. *The location of the garden of Eden.* AJSL 39, 15—31.

351. W. F. Albright. *The Babylonian antediluvian kings*. JAOS 43, 323—329.
352. W. E. Barnes. *Who wrote the first chapter of Genesis?* Exp. 22, 1921, 401—411.
353. G. A. Barton. *Were the Biblical foundations of Christian theology derived from Babylonia?* JBL 40, 1921, 87—103.
354. G. Beer. *Zur Geschichte und Beurteilung des Schöpfungsberichtes. Gen. 1, 1—2, 4, nebst einem Exkurs über Gen. 49, 8—12 und 22—26*. Buddes Festschrift, Beiheft z. ZAW 34, 20—30.
355. A. Brassac. *La cosmogonie de la Bible et la cosmogonie des peuples anciens (Gen. 1)*. Rev. apolog. 17, vol. 33, 700—703.
356. F. C. Burkitt. *Note on the Table of Nations*. Gen. 10, JThS 21, 233 ff.
357. P. E. Burrows. *Notes on the antediluvian kings*. Orientalia 7, 50—58.
358. A. Carnoy. *Paradis d'Orient. Paradis d'Occident*. Museon 35, 213—239.
359. W. Caspari. *Tohuwabohu*. MVAG, 1917, II, 1—20.
360. E. Chiera. *Archaeological and critical notes*. Crozer Quarterly I, 85—92.
361. A. Causse. *Le jardin d'Elohim et la source de vie*. RHR 81, 1920, 289—315.
362. S. T. Clay. *A Hebrew Deluge Story in Cuneiform*. 1922. Rev. Allis, PTR 24, 659—665; Keyser, Bible Champion 29, 75—76; Kyle, BS 79, 515—517; Maynard, JR 3, 328—330; Meissner, TLZ 48, 127; Schroeder, OLZ, 1922, 954—956; Sayce, ET 34, 76—77; Contenau, Syria 4, 174—175; Gustavs, TLB 45, 49—53.
363. — *The Origin of Biblical Traditions. Hebrew Legends in Babylonia and Israel*. 1923, p. 224. Rev. Sayce, JRAS, 1924, 111—116; Modona, Riv. trim. d. stud. fil. e. relig. 4, 344.
364. A. Deimel. *Der Drachenkämpfer Ninib*. Bibl. 2, 461—472.
365. — *Der Drachenkampf*. Orientalia 5, 26—42.
366. — *Der Verfasser von Gen. 4, 17—24 und die moderne Pentateuchkritik*. Bibl. 3, 438—440.

367. A. Deimel. *Geschichte eines neuen Keilschrifttextes über Paradies und Sündenfall, freiwilligen Erlösungstod und Auferstehung des Gottes Marduk*. Bibl. 5, 57—64.
368. L. Dennefeld. *La personnalité de Tiamat*. Rev. d. Sc. Rel. 2, 1—12.
369. P. Dhorme. *Les traditions babyloniennes sur les origines*. RB, 1919, 350—371.
370. H. de Dorlodot. *Le Darwinisme au point de vue de l'orthodoxie catholique, I. L'orig. des espèces*. Bruxelles, 1921, p. 194. Rev. Synave, RSPT 11, 131—133.
371. G. R. Driver. *The Epic of Creation*. Theology 8, 2—13.
372. A. Ehrenzweig. *Biblische und klassische Urgeschichte*. ZAW 38, 1919, 65—86.
373. — *Zusatz*. ZAW 39, 82—83. Cf. 414.
374. H. K. Gowen. *The Cainite and Sethite genealogies of Gen. 4 and 5*. ATR II, 326—327.
375. G. B. Gray. *Cain's sacrifice, a new theory*. Exp., 1921, 21, 161—182.
376. W. B. Greene. *Yet another criticism of the theory of evolution*. PTR 20, 537—561.
377. H. Gressmann. *Die Paradiessage*. In Harnacks Festschrift, p. 24—42.
378. O. Gruppe. *Kain*. ZAW 39, 67—76.
379. H. Gunkel. *Das Märchen im A.T.* Tübingen, Mohr, 1921, p. 179.
380. — *Schöpfung und Chaos*. 2nd edition, 1921.
381. — *Le récit biblique de la création*. RTP 6, 1918, 173—199.
382. R. Hauer. *Die Sündflut im Lichte moderner Forschung*. Theol. Prak. Quart. 76, 1923, 61—76.
383. E. Hertlein. *Rahab*. ZAW 38, 113—154.
384. D. L. Holbrook. *The point of view in the first chapter of Genesis*. BS 79, 452—466.
385. A. van Hoonacker. *Is the Narrative of the Fall a Myth?* Exp., 1918, 16, 373—400.
386. E. E. Kellett. *The prodigiously long ages of the patriarchs*. ET 33, 167—169.
387. — *The ages of the patriarchs*. ET 33, 231—232.
388. L. W. King. *Legends of Babylon and Egypt in Relation to Hebrew Tradition*. 1918, p. 155. Rev. (Anon.), Month 55,

- Vol. 133, 472—475; Burkitt, JThS 21, 280—282; Gray, PEFQS 51, 140—142; Loisy, RHLR 6, 297—301, and RC 86, 161—165; Luckenbill, AJSL 36, 167—168; Mercer, ATR 2, 242—243; J. M. P. Smith, AJTh 23, 267f.
389. E. G. H. Kraeling. *Metušelach*. ZAW 40, 154—155.
390. — *The origin and real name of Nimrod*. AJSL 38, 214—220.
391. — *Terach*. ZAW 40, 153—154.
392. — *The tower of Babel*. JAOS 40, 276—281.
393. S. Landersdorfer. *Die Bibel und die süd-arabische Altertumsforschung*. 1920, p. 72. Rev. Synave, RSPT 11, 151—152.
394. — *Die sumerischen Parallelen zur bibl. Urgeschichte*. Münster, 1917. Cf. N. Schlögl, Theol. Prak. Quart. 72, 1919, 247 f.
395. S. Langdon. *The Chaldean kings before the flood*. JRAS, 1923, 251—259.
396. — *Le poème sumérien du Paradis, du Déluge, et de la chute de l'homme*. 1919, Rev. Mercer, JSOR 3, 86—88; Ball, Athenaeum, 1920, No. 4709, 157—158.
397. — *The Babylonian Epic of Creation*. 1923, p. 225.
398. N. G. Lawson. *The early chapters of Genesis*. Theology 5, 1922, 297—303.
399. P. Leidecker. *Débris de mythes Cananéens dans les neuf premiers chapitres de la Genèse*. Rev. Dhorme, RB 32, 477—478; Dussaud, RHR, 1923, 120—123; Synave, RSPT 12, 82—83.
400. D. D. Luckenbill. *An early Version of the Atrahasis Epic*. AJSL 39, 153—160.
401. E. Mangelot. *Hexameron*. Dict. d. theol. cathol. fasc. 49, 1920, 2325—2354.
402. H. W. Magoun. *The literary form of the first chapter of Genesis*. BS 79, 153—172.
403. J. A. Maynard. *The mark of Cain*. Gen. 4, 13—15, ATR 2, 325—326.
404. J. Meinhold. *Die Erzählungen vom Paradies und Sündenfall*. In Buddes Festschrift, p. 122—131. Rev. Synave, RSPT 11, 134.
405. S. A. B. Mercer. *A new turning point in the study of creation*. ATR 3, 1—17.

406. S. A. B. Mercer. *Fresh light on the history of the flood*. ATR 5, 299—307.
407. A. Miller. *Ein neuer Sündenfalls-Siegelzylinder*. TQS 99, 1917, 1—28.
408. J. Morgenstern. *The Sources of the Creation Story*. Genesis 1, 1—2, 4, AJSL 36, 169—212.
409. H. T. Obbing. *Het bijbelsch Paradijsverhaal en de Babylonische Bronnen*. 1917. Rev. Mercer, JSOR 3, 50; Böhl, OLZ 25, 512—513.
410. P. M. Périer. *Transformisme et création*. Rev. apol. 34, 1922, 237—265; 350—358.
411. J. P. Peters. *The Tower of Babel at Borsippa*. JAOS 40, 157—159.
412. J. Poplicka. *Opowiadania o potopie w literaturze babilonskiej a w Biblii*. Przegląd. Teolog. Bib., 1921, 68—79. Cf. RSPT 10, 512.
413. S. Reinach. *La naissance d'Ève*. RHR 78, 1918, 185—206.
414. N. Rhodokanakis. *Gen. 2—4*. ZAW 39, 76—82, mit Zusatz von A. Ehrenzweig, ZAW 39, 82—83.
415. A. E. J. Robinson. *The garden of Eden*. Int. 19, 1923, 214—218.
416. J. Rovira. *Enuma eliš o Poema babilonico de la Creacion*. 1922, p. 46. Rev. Condamin, Rech. d. Sc. Rel., SR, 1923, 95.
417. E. Sachsse. *Der jahwistische Schöpfungsbericht. Ein Erklärungsversuch. Gen. 2, 4—7*. ZAW 39, 276—283.
418. P. Schepens. *Le sens de min dans le récit de la Création*. Rech. d. Sc. Rel., 1923, 161—164.
419. G. Elliot Smith. *Evolution of the Dragon Myth*. 1919.
420. B. Sommer. *Der babylonisch-biblische Schöpfungsbericht und die Wissenschaft*. 1922, p. 76.
421. — *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Bibel*. 1922.
422. A. Ungnad. *Das wiedergefundene Paradies*. 1923.
423. L. Waterman. *The Date of the Deluge*. AJSL 39, 233—247.
424. P. M. Witzel. *Angebliche sumerische Parallelen zur biblischen Urgeschichte*. TQS 100, 1919, 199—224.
425. T. van Tichelen. *Schepping en zondvloed*. 1920, p. 199. Rev. Vanderworst, RB, 1922, 135—139.
426. H. Zimmern. *Die sieben Weisen Babyloniens*. ZA 35, 151—154.

ALBRIGHT locates Eden in Somaliland. In second article corrects Langdon's readings in 394. BARNES thinks that Gen. 1 was a "prophetic" hymn praising the wonderworking word of God, which was expanded by P, made distinctly monotheistic, and rearranged under six headings. BARTON discusses the bearing of the new Ashur creation texts. BEER dates Gen. 1 in the time of Deutero-Isaiah. BURKITT compares with a newly discovered Sumerian list. CUSH in v. 8. should be Kish BURROWS studies Langdon's text 394.

CARNOY finds the essential elements of the story of Eden in many pre-Semitic, Semitic, and Aryan legends. CASPARI compares *bohu* with name of goddess Bau! CAUSSE traces the development of the paradise myth in biblical literature including Pseudepigrapha and N.T. CHIERA, on the ten creation stories of Nippur. CLAY finds another argument for his Amorite theory in the Atrahasis tablet newly reëdited by him. The deluge story of Babylonia would be Amorite in origin. The same point of view it set forth in the book on origins. In his review SAYCE shows that the basis of culture was literary and bound up with the clay tablet and the cuneiform script, hence not northern. The Amorites were Mitannians. The deluge story is not Amorite. DEIMEL studies Witzel's book and does not find the dragon myth in Gen. 1. In his article on Gen. 4 he claims that the statement that the author did not know the flood, does not work because it would apply also to Sumerian sources. The last article on tablet 6 of the creation epic. DENNEFELD shows, independently of Dhorme, RB 1919, 355 ff., that Tiamat was a real woman. The monuments representing the conquest of a dragon have nothing to do with *Enuma eliš*. Gen. 1 is not a monotheistic redaction of this epic. DHORME studies the divine names in the beginning of *Enuma eliš*. In his first lecture (p. 7—80) DE DORLODOT opposes concordism (the day period); the chronology of the six days is symbolic. According to EHRENZWEIG, the Cain-Abel myth is parallel to the Romulus-Remus. In the early form of the story Cain was killed. Romulus is also parallel to Enoch. GOWEN says that the original list had seven names. GRAY rejects Ehrenzweig's theory. GRESSMANN compares Adam to Gilgamesh. Eve is a goddess of Sheol. The knowledge mentioned is sexual. GUNKEL defines myth, tradition, legend, and tale. There are only traces of tales in the O. T. because the history of the religion of Yahwe is in a measure a war against

tales. GUNKEL reëdits his book written in 1894 without change. In his article on the biblical story of creation he says that Gen. 1 is scarcely mythological because Hebrew religion was too strong for mythology. Thus is this chapter a real revelation from God. HERTLEIN, on the Rahab myth. HOLBROOK finds in Gen. 1 nine aspects of culminations similar to modern scientific views. VAN HOONACKER examines recent views. KELLETT says that figures were manipulated for sheer pleasure in arithmetic. KING, on the creation and flood stories. KRAELING compares Methushelah to Lugal-maradda, finds Terach as a place name N of Harran, and shows that Nimrod was a city king of ancient Marad. The tower of Babel was at first at Borsippa. LANDERSDORFER, third edition. Arabia is the home of the Semites; Paradise was in the Persian gulf. LANGDON claims to have discovered the long sought Sumerian source for the list of Berossus. In his review of Langdon, BALL deals with Hebrew myths. LANGDON gives a complete transliteration and translation of *Enuma eliš* with most important notes. LEIDECKER claims that these myths are explained by a widespread worship of the mother goddess. LUCKENBILL *versus* Clay. MAGOUN studies rhythmical form. MAYNARD finds that Cain's circumcision was a charm against the jinn. MEINHOLD makes a searching distinction of sources in the story of Eden. In J 1 man is made from the dust (nomadic feature). Paradise is an oasis in the east. The pair of naked youths, Adam and Eve, do not have to work, are not subject to death, and are driven to the desert as a penalty. In J 2 man is from the ground (a tiller). Eden is in the north. Man and woman, not naked, are subject to work and death, and driven to cultivate fields. MERCER compares the creation story with Babylonian sources and finds an early double tradition of the flood. MILLER interprets a new seal in the light of mythology. MORGENSTERN finds no direct borrowing from Babylonian mythology. The sabbath motive was introduced later into the story when it was revised by theologians. PETERS endorses Kraeling 391. POPLICKA compares with Babylonian material. REINACH studies gnostic interpretations. RHODOKANAKIS finds a conflict between Yahweh and a serpent god. ROBINSON shows in the story of Eden a deep philosophy underlying folklore. ROVIRA finds no direct influence on O. T. SACHSSE rearranges text, and suppresses 4b. According to SCHEPENS *min* means kind rather than genus only. SMITH on deluge stories, as a part of a pan-

Egyptian scheme. UNGNAD—Paradise is a constellation. WATERMAN, date of Deluge was 36.300 years ago according to the Nippur scribes, but Babylonian chronology is insecure before 3.000 B. C. VAN TICHELEN is traditional. ZIMMERN, on antediluvian sages. See also the section on Babel and Bible in the preceeding (General) Bibliography of the O. T.

GEN. 12—50

(INCLUDING HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE HEBREWS)

427. W. F. Albright. *Shinar-Šangar and its monarch Amraphel*. AJSL 40, 125—133.
428. — *A colony of Cretan mercenaries on the coast of the Negeb*. JPOS 1, 187—194.
429. — *The name Rebecca*. JBL 39, 165—166.
430. O. T. Allis. *The name Joseph*. PTR 18, 646—659.
431. — *The fear of Isaac*. Gen. 31, 42, PTR 16, 299—304.
432. H. H. B. Ayles. *An interesting historical document*. Int. 19, 219—223.
433. H. de Barenton. *Abraham en Chanaan*. RMC 203, 79—125.
434. — *Abraham en Egypte*. RMC 202, 355—379.
435. Omar El-Barghuthi. *Judicial courts among the Bedouin of Palestine*. JPOS 2, 34—65.
436. M. Blanckenhorn. *Die Steinzeit Palästina-Syriens und Nordafrikas*. 1921, p. 121. Rev. Lemonnyer, RSPT 12, 358; Löhr, OLZ 26, 276.
437. F. M. Th. Böhl. *Tud'alia, Zeitgenosse Abrahams um 1650 v. Chr.* ZAW 42, 148—153.
438. W. Caspari. *Abrahams Berufung*. Gen. 12, 1—3, Allgem. Evang. luth. Kirch. Ztg. 52, 325—330; 346—348.
439. S. T. Clay. *The Amorite name Jerusalem*. JPOS 1, 28—32.
440. — *The Empire of the Amorites*. 1919. Rev. Barton, BS 1919, 485—487; Friedrich, ZDPV 45, 224—226; Mercer, JSOR 3, 96—97; Olmstead, AJTh 23, 525—527; (Petrie) AE 1920, 21—22; Pfeiffer, Bil. 14, 362—363.
441. A. Condamin. *La date de Hammourabi révisée*. Rech. d. Sc. Rel., 1923, 84—88.
442. — *Le nom «Abraham.»* Rech. d. Sc. Rel., 9, 258.
443. S. A. Cook. *The Semites*. Cambridge Ancient History I, 181 ff.
444. A. Deimel. *Šumer-Shinear*. Bibl. 2, 71—74.

445. O. Eissfeldt. *Stammesgeschichte und Novelle in der Geschichte von Jakob und von seinen Söhnen*. Gunkels Festschrift, 56—77.
446. J. Frieboes. *Die Rolle des Isaak in der israelitischen Geschichtsschreibung*. Theol. SK 92, 78—80.
447. J. Gressmann. *Die Anfänge Israels*. Rev. Eissfeldt, TLZ 48, 154—157.
448. — *Ursprung und Entwicklung der Joseph-Sage*. Gunkels Festschrift, 1—55.
449. H. Gunkel. *Die Komposition der Joseph-Geschichten*. ZDMG 76, 55—71.
450. F. Hommel. *Zu Gen. 14 und insbesondere zu Ariokh von Ellasar*. BZ 15, 213—218.
451. J. Horowitz. *Die Joseph-Erzählung*. 1921, p. 156. Rev. Staerk OLZ 26, 161—162.
452. A. Jirku. *Die älteste Geschichte Israels im Rahmen lehrhafter Darstellungen*. 1917. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 24, 123—124.
453. — *Zu Gen. 14*. ZAW 39, 152—156.
454. — *Die Hauptprobleme der Anfangsgeschichte Israels*. 1918, p. 76. Rev. Caspari, TLB 40, 87; Wiener, BS 77, 113—114.
455. — *Zum historischen Stil von Gen. 14*. ZAW 39, 313—314.
456. — *Der Name El Beth-El*. Gen. 35, 7, ZAW 39, 158—159.
457. — *Der Vertrag zwischen Jakob und Laban*. Gen. 31, ZAW 39, 149—150.
458. P. Karge. *Rephaim. Die vorgeschichtliche Kultur Palästinas und Phöniziens*. 1918. Rev. Baudissin, DLZ 40, 792—794; Baumstark, Theol. Rev. 18, 351—356; Dalman, TLZ 44, 51—52; Linder, Z. Kath. Theol. 43, 124—132; Rowan, RB 1919, 582; Schultz, OLZ 22, 163—175; Littmann, Gött. G. A. 184, 152—156; J. Herrmann, LZB 71, 680—682.
459. R. Kittel. *Der scherzende Ismael*. ZAW 40, 155.
460. König. *Neueste Fragen der Pentateuchkritik*. ZDMG 72, 1918, 87—110.
461. M. G. Kyle and W. F. Albright. *Results of the archeological survey of the Ghor*. BS 81, 276—291.
462. S. Landersdorfer. *Das hethitische Problem und die Bibel*. Theol. u. Glaube 11, 1919, 22—33.

463. D. D. Luckenbill. *On Israel's origins*. AJTh 22, 24—53.
464. E. J. H. Mackay. *Observation on a megalithic Building at Bet Sawir, Palestine*. JPOS I, 95—102.
465. D. S. Margoliouth. *Genesis* 37, 28. ET 33, 39—40.
466. J. E. McFadyen. *Bethel*. Exp. 26, 241—255.
467. J. Meinhold. *Die jawistischen Berichte in Gen. 12—50*. ZAW 39, 42—57.
468. J. A. Montgomery. *Prefix n in some Hebrew names*. JAOS 43, 50—51.
469. J. de Morgan. *Note sur la préhistoire de l'Afrique du Nord*. Rev. afric. 1923, 150—158.
470. — *Les origines des Sémites et celles des Indo-Européens*. Rev. d. synthèse histor. 34, 7—34.
471. C. Noel. *Les Hittim*. Rev. Tun. 1921, 208—216.
472. — *L'Idumée*. Rev. Tun. 1921, 69—72.
473. J. Offord. *Coptic terms and the O. T.* PEF 1918, 137—138.
474. — *Cyprus and Mizraim*. PEF 1918, 138—139.
475. — *The Egyptian name for Lebanon*. PEF 1918, 183—185.
476. — *Palestinian scarabs*. PEF 1918, 175—179.
477. — *Peniel and a Hebrew name at Elephantine*. PEF 1920, 77—78.
478. — *The Princes of the Bakers and the Cupbearers*. PEF 1918, 139—142.
479. Oxonius. *The history of Joseph and the higher criticism*. BS 1923, 186—208.
480. F. E. Peiser. *Zum ältesten Namen Kana'ans*. OLZ 1919, 5—8.
481. W. J. Perry. *An interpretation of O. T. traditions*. J. Manch Eg. Or. S. 10, 1923, 35—51.
482. J. P. Peters. *Bible and Spade*. 1922. Rev. Macalister, PEF 1923, 47—49; Raven, BR 7, 628—633; Webster, BS 79, 227—228.
483. — *The home of the Semites*. JAOS 39, 243—260.
484. W. F. Petrie. *Palestinian scarabs*. PEF 1919, 46.
485. W. F. Phythian-Adams. *Pre-Philistine Inhabitants of Palestine*, PEF 1921, 170—171.
486. — *Report on soundings at Tell Jemmeh*. PEF 1923, 140—146.

487. T. G. Pinches. *The Arioch of Genesis*. PSBA 1918, 113—114.
488. E. Sachsse. *Die Bedeutung des Namens Israel, eine geographisch-geschichtliche Untersuchung*. 1922, p. 91. Rev. Synave, RSPT 12, 76—77; Horst, TLZ 48, 55.
489. R. N. Salaman. *The racial origins of Jewish types*. London, Spottiswoode, 1922, p. 22.
490. D. Sidersky. *Le songe de Pharaon*. JA 1921, I, 175.
491. J. Slaby. *Genesis 41, 41—42 und die altägyptischen Denkmäler*. BZ 16, 18—33.
492. — *Genesis 50, 2—10 im Lichte der altägyptischen Denkmäler und Urkunden*. TQS 100, 1919, 225—251.
493. W. Spiegelberg. *Die Beisetzung des Patriarchen Jakob (Gen. 50, 2ff.) im Lichte der ägyptischen Quellen*. OLZ 26, 421—424.
494. W. N. Stearns. *Notes on the troglodytes in Palestine*. BS 77, 14—22.
495. C. Steuernagel. *Bemerkungen zu Gen. 17*. Buddes Festschrift, p. 172—179.
496. L. H. Vincent. *La sépulture des patriarches d'après la Bible*. RB 1920, 507—539.
497. D. Völter. *Die Patriarchen Israels im Lichte der ägyptischen Mythologie*. 1921. Rev. Bilabel, OLZ 25, 517—519; Herrmann, TLZ 42, 259—260.
498. R. Weill. *L'Installation des Israelites en Palestine et la légende des Patriarches*. RHR 1923, 69—120.

According to ALBRIGHT, Amraphel was the king of Sangar or Hana, whose capital was Rezeph, who would have captured Babylon in the seventeenth century. The second article is important for Gen. 26 and explains the form 'Awwim in Deut. 2, 23. The third article sees in Rebecca an earth goddess. ALLIS, *versus* Barton, refuses to identify Joseph with Yashub-ilu. The "fear of Isaac" is a name which dated from the tragic experience at Mt. Moriah. AYLES finds Gen. 14 in agreement with E. DE BARENTON has some wild etymologies, and a long discussion of Gen. 14; he identifies Gihon with Jordan (p. 98—102), Magan with Mahanaim (p. 102—103). The Abshe picture at Benihassan represents Abraham's family. EL BARGHUTHI studies nomadic procedure. BLANCKENHORN shows the importance of mesolithic in Syria (although there was none in Egypt). BÖHL connects Abraham's move with Harri invasion. CLAY shows that the name Jerusalem is a compound of the divine

name Uru, found also in Ariel. His *Empire of the Amorites* restates the Amurru theory. OLMSTEAD criticises some of its geographical data. PETRIE defends the existence of a strong Semitic power in N Syria at the close of the Old Kingdom and at the close of the Middle Kingdom. CONDAMIN defends the new date of Hammurabi 1945—1900 on the basis of Kugler's book *Von Moses bis Paulus* (cf. 269). He calls attention to texts edited by Lutz with the name Abraham. COOK outlines the early history of the Semites. DEIMEL shows that, in accordance with phonetic laws, Shumer is dialectic for Ki-en-gi. EISSFELDT traces the sources L, J, E in the story of Jacob and his sons. GOTTSBERGER defends MT in Gen. 37, 9—11. In his article on the Joseph saga, GRESSMANN shows the development of the story. GUNKEL shows the way it was put together. HOMMEL says that Arioch was certainly Rim-Sin (perhaps Rimakhu, which became Rivakku). JIRKU says that Amraphel was not Hammurabi. He compares Tid'al with Tudhalia of Hittite documents. Gen. 14 is historical and is compared to Tiglath-Pilezer's prism. El Bethel is a divinity, as we see from Elephantine data. The contract between Jacob and Laban is similar in form to the treaties in KB. I. KARGE's excellent book takes up very fully the prehistory of Palestine. KITTEL compares Ishmael's mockery with the Dionysiac mysteries. KYLE localises cities of the plain. KÖNIG studies Joseph's cycle. LUCKENBILL shows that there was an Aramaean wave in 1400 B. C. The Levites were missionaries of Yahweh worship. The prophets continued their work. MARGOLIOUTH *versus* König (cf. 460) and his theory of double source of the Joseph story. Claims that König misunderstood Gen. 37, 28. MEINHOLD distinguishes two sources in J. MONTGOMERY gives an interesting etymology of Nephtali. DE MORGAN shows in his first article that Capsian (Getulian, of Pallary) covers archeolithic and mesolithic. Paleolithic industry was prolonged in N Africa because the glacial zone variations were too weak to change the culture. Getulian and Aurignacian are not, as Boule says, two geographical aspects of the same Mediterranean culture. There is no influence of Capsian on Aurignacian. There is no true neolithic. In the second article, he shows that Arabia is the home of the Semites, and accepts the dessication hypothesis. In his second article, NOEL says that the Kenites were not shepherds, since the son of Cain built the first city; they were akin to the Horites. OFFORD finds Coptic

terms in the story of Joseph. Following Naville, he explains Mizraim as "two enclosures." The Canaanites whom the Egyptians knew, may have called the Lebanon *Lmnnm*. He discusses also the Hyksos scarabs of Weill, saying that this (Anra) type became stereotyped in Palestine. He compares Peniel of Gen. 32, 31 to Elephantine, cuneiform, and punic material and tells us of Pharaoh's guilty officials in the light of Egyptian documents. "OXONIUS" finds that the story of Joseph is all of one piece. PEISER shows that an ancient Knh gave both *Kinaḥi* and the Egyptian *Fnh*. PERRY compares Hebrew culture with the dolmen builders. PETERS defends a northern origin of Semites. PETRIE *versus* Weill, says that the Palestinian scarabs were not Palestinian at all, but Egyptian, and that Anra is a misreading for Du-ne-ra, gift of Ra. PHYTHIAN-ADAMS says that these Pre-Philistine came from Egypt but were not necessarily Egyptians. He found Gerar at Tell Jemmeh, eight miles from Gaza. PINCHES equates again Arioch with Rim-Sin. SACHSSE, continuing his article in ZAW 1914, 1—15, says that the name Israel is not that of a person but was adopted when Moses unified the people. It is derived from *el iašar*. SALAMAN shows that the Amorites were a fair type in 1500 in Palestine. The Hittites were moving south. Three out of four people in Askalon were Hittitelike. The Hebrews were a Bedawy tribe settling among an Amorite and Hittite population, with a large Philistine element; the Hittite type dominated. In Gen. 41, SIDERSKY prefers the Samaritan text to MT. In the first article SLABY compares the insigna given to Joseph to the gold of bravery and the gold of favor, of which Egyptian officials boast in their biographical records. The second article studies funeral rites. SPIEGELBERG shows that the embalmers were physicians, as the text says. STEARNS studies early population of Palestine. STEUERNAGEL finds four sources of P. VINCENT describes the Haram of Hebron, defends an etymology of Abraham from *ra'amu* (p. 508) and gives important data on the early history of Palestine, and especially of Hebron. VÖLTER, new (second) edition, little changed and not improved. WEILL says that the Horites were Arabs. The patriarchal stories come from Canaanite legends. Elim (the Gods) is El Tor, described by Agatharchides as a healing sanctuary. Yahweh is the god of Kadesh. On Gen. 13 cf. Jirku 588. On Gen. 14 cf. Albright 502. On Gen. 46, 28 cf. Offord 544.

EXODUS

499. H. C. Ackerman. *Gen. 3, 14* (by error for Ex. 3, 14) ATR 3, 328—329.
500. — *The Decalogue and Sacrifice*. ATR 4, 241—244.
501. — *The two tables of stone*. ATR 4, 67—69.
502. W. F. Albright. *A Revision of Early Hebrew Chronology*. JPOS, I, 49—79.
503. P. J. Baldensperger. *The immovable East*. PEF 1920, 161—166.
504. P. Boylan. *Egypt and Israel in the Days of Tutankhamon*. Dublin Rev. 173, 94—111.
505. W. W. Cannon. *Passover and Priest's Code*. Exp. 1920, 226—235.
506. J. Clédat. *Notes sur l'isthme de Suez*. Bull. d. l'Inst. franç. d'archeol. orientale 16, 201—228. Cf. RB 1920, 301—303.
507. A. Cowley. *A Passage in the Mesha Inscription and the Early Form of the Israelitish Divine Name*. JRAS 1920, 175—184.
508. S. Daiches. *Exod. 5, 4—5. The meaning of עַם הָאָרֶץ*. JQR 12, 32—34.
509. L. Eckenstein. *A history of Sinai*. 1921, p. 202. Rev. S. A. Cook, JThS 23, 326—327; Sellin, TLZ 48, 74—75; Wreszinski, OLZ 26, 59—62.
510. F. Field. *O. T. Revision Notes*. ET 30, 427; 476—477.
511. J. Friedrich (and H. Zimmern). *Hethitische Gesetze*. 1922, p. 32.
512. — *Nachträge*. 1923, p. 6.
513. S. Gardiner. *The Delta Residence of the Ramessides*. J. of Eg. Arch. 5, 627—638; 179—200; 242—271; map.
514. — *The Supposed Egyptian Equivalent of the Name of Goshen*. J. E. A. 5, 218—233.
515. J. Göttberger. *Die Hülle des Moses nach Ex. 34 und 2 Kor. 3*. BZ 16, 1—17.
516. H. Gressmann. *Die Lade Jahves und das Allerheiligste des salomonischen Tempels*. 1920, p. 72. Rev. Jirku, TLB 42, 7—8.
517. J. S. Griffiths. *The Exodus in the Light of Archaeology*. 1923. Rev. Loisy, RC 1924, 83; Fernandez, Bibl. 5, 80—81; Synave, RSPT 13, 101; Robinson, Theol. 7, 109—110.
518. R. Hartmann. *Zelt und Lade*. ZAW 37, 209—244.

519. P. Haupt. *The etymologie of Manna*. Am J. Philol. 43, 247—249.
520. — *The sixth Egyptian plague*. AJPhilol. 43, 238—239.
521. R. B. Henderson. *Akhnaton and Moses*. CQR 193, 109—131.
522. W. Hoppe. *Jura und Kreide der Sinaihalbinsel*. ZDPV 45, 61, 79; 97—219.
523. A. Jirku. *Elohim und ilu/ilāni Habiru/i*. ZAW 39, 156—158.
524. — *Die Gesetze der Hethiter und das mosaische Gesetz*. TLB 43, 177—179.
525. — *ilu Ḥa-bi-ru, der Stammesgott der Habiru-Hebräer*. OLZ 24, 246—247.
526. — *Eine neue altassyrische Parallele zum mosaischen Gesetz und zum Codex des Hammurapi*. TLB 41, 401—405.
527. J. L. Kelso. *The Hebrew Tabernacle as a Work of Architecture*. BS 79, 62—71.
528. J. Kroon. *De tocht door de Roode zee geen phantasie*. Studien 54, 1922, II, 63ff.
529. M. Lambert. *Notes lexicographiques et exégétiques*. REJ 70, 88—90, 92, 209.
530. S. Langdon. *The Habiru and the Hebrews*. ET 31, 324—329.
531. I. Linder. *Das Siegeslied des Moses (Ex. 15)*. Z. f. kath. Theol. 44, 1920, 43—77.
532. A. Mallon. *Les Hébreux en Egypte*. 1922, p. 213. Rev. RB, 1922, 628—631; ET 67, 540—543; Mercer, JSOR 7, 90—91; Podechard, Rev. SR 3, 379—381; Spiegelberg, OLZ 26, 203—204; Synave, RSPT 12, 83; Desnoyers, BLE 1924, 70—72.
533. J. A. Maynard. *The bearing of the change from Yahu to Yahweh in Mosaic times*. ATR 1, 93—95.
534. B. Meissner. *Hethiter und hethitische Gesetzgebung*. DLZ, 1923, 55—64.
535. S. A. B. Mercer. *Merneptah's Israel and the Exodus*. ATR 5, 96—107.
536. — *New Evidence on the Origin of Israel's Law*. ATR 4, 314—324.
537. — *Tutankhamen and Egyptology*. Milwaukee, Morehouse, 1923. Rev. Hallock, ATR 6, 336—337.
538. J. Morgenstern. *The Elohist narrative in Exodus 3, 1—15*. AJSL 37, 242—262.

539. B. Moritz. *Der Sinaikult in heidnischer Zeit*. 1916. Rev. Brandenburg, OLZ 1918, 89—91.
540. J. Offord. *Some Migdols of Palestine and Egypt*. PEF 1920, 23—29.
541. — *Plan of a Migdol*. PEF 1919, 175—177.
542. — *The Red Sea*. PEF 1920, 176—181.
543. — *The Route of the Exodus. Wanderings in the Desert*. PEF 1918, 35—36.
544. — *The Semitic name of Pithom*. PEF 1919, 182—184.
545. — *On-Anu, Heliopolis in a Semitic inscription; and the Gilgals and Massebahs of Palestine*. PEF 1919, 123—133.
546. F. Perles. *Zur Aussprache von ירהוה*. OLZ 1918, 129ff.
547. B. Range. *Begleitworte zur geologischen Karte der Isthmuswüste*. ZDPV 45, 48—61; map; Note by A. Alt, p. 224.
548. G. Richter. *Der Blutbräutigam*. ZAW 39, 123—128.
549. T. H. Robinson. *The Golden Calf*. Exp. 1922, 24, 121—135.
550. H. F. Rubinstein and H. Glover. *Exodus, a dramatic sequence*. London, 1923.
551. S. H. Sayce. *The Khabiri*. ET 33, 43—44.
552. R. Savignac. *La région de Aïn-Quedis*. RB 1922, 55—81.
553. H. Schmidt. *Mose und der Dekalog*. Gunkels Festschrift, 78—119.
554. E. Sellin. *Mose und seine Bedeutung für die israelitisch-jüdische Religionsgeschichte*. 1922. Rev. Stummer, OLZ 27, 83—84; Procksch TLB 45, 69—70; Sellin Th. Geg. 17, 126—128.
555. J. M. P. Smith. *The name of Moses*. AJSL 35, 110—112.
556. H. Torczyner. *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels*. 1922, p. 80. Rev. Dhorme, RB 32, 472—474.
557. — *אב יר kein Stierbild*. ZAW 39, 1921, 296—300.
558. D. Völter. *Mirjam*. ZAW 38, 111—112.
559. — *Zu den althebräischen Inschriften von Sinai, speziell zu der Inschrift Nr. 349*. NTT 13, 21—59.
560. — *Ägyptische Parallelen zu Ex. 20, 7*. ZAW 38, 112.
561. L. A. Waddell. *The Chaldee Father-God and the Pillar of Cloud*. ET 33, 501—503.
562. L. Waterman. *Pre-Israelite Laws in the Book of the Covenant*. AJSL 38, 36—54.

563. A. J. Wensinck. *The refused dignity*. Vol. of Stud. pres. to E. G. Browne, p. 491—499.
564. A. E. Whatham. *The Exodus in the Light of Archeology*. BS 1918, 543—560.
565. H. W. Wiener. *Exod.* 4, 16. BS 1919, 234.
566. — *The Exodus in the Light of Archeology*. BS 1918, 561—580.
567. — *The Law of Change in the Bible*. BS 1921, 73—102.
568. — *Notes on the Exodus*. BS 1919, 474—483.
569. — *Pithom and Raamses*. AE 1923, 75—77.
570. — *Professor Barton on "The religion of Moses."* BS 77, 334—344.
571. — *The religion of Moses*. BS 1919, 323—358, and reprint. Rev. S. A. Cook, JThS 21, 376—378.
572. — *The text of Exodus*. 18, 10f., BS 1919, 483—484.
573. R. D. Wilson. *Critical note on Exod.* 6, 3, PTR 1924, 108—119.
574. P. Wood. *Moses, the founder of preventive medicine*. 1920, p. 128. Rev. Chase, Theol, I, 110—111.

ACKERMAN says that Yahweh was a Midianite deity but Moses gave to the name a new significance. The second article studies bearing of Decalogue on problem of sacrifice in Yahwism. The third article treats of the origin of the Decalogue. In a remarkable paper, ALBRIGHT shows that the entrance into Goshen synchronises with Hyksos invasion. The defeat of Israel by Merneptah is the dispersion of an encampment of Danites in the plain of Sharon. The Aaronid priesthood was composed of Egyptians, Egyptianised Hebrews, and Nubians. The Exodus is dated 1260, and the conquest of Canaan 1230. The author also takes up the problem of Gen. 14. BALDENSPERGER studies feasts and processions and illustrates the song of Miriam (Exod. 15) with a fellaha song given in transcription. BOYLAN places the Exodus in the 18th dynasty. The oppression began with the expulsion of the Hyksos. CANNON says that Ex. 12, 1—14, an early document inserted in P, is the oldest form of the Passover rite, a purely domestic rite, distinct from Mazzoth. Dt. 16, 1—8 combines Passover and Mazzoth in one feast. CLÉDAT identifies Pihakhirot with a small sanctuary of Hathor with a fort. COWLEY shows that early form was Yāw. In Mesha 18 the word is the verb "to be." DAICHES, endorsing Sulzberger,

brings up this passage as an additional argument for the latter's thesis. Miss ECKENSTEIN contributes the first history of Sinai from Egypt to Islam. She studies the Moon cult and thinks that Serabit is the mountain of the Law. FIELD's notes for RV on text of Exodus. GARDINER shows that several cities derived their name from Rameses II. Pithom would probably be Tell el Retabeh and Sheku, Tell el Maskhuteh both in the Ras el Wady. The residence city was at or near Pelusium, the Ramses of the Bible is either that or it is unknown at present. This city was the place of Moses' birth and the scene of his activity. Ramses is not Tell el Retabeh, as Petrie claimed. In the second article he shows that Brugsch's reading QoSeM is an error for Šsmt. GÖTTESBERGER translates Ex. 34, notes the three stories interwoven, and compares to 2 Cor. 3. GRESSMANN says that the cherubs of the ark are of Egyptian origin, being unlike the Babylonian protecting deities. There was a bull image between them. JIRKU does not agree with him in his review. GRIFFITHS, conservative. Exodus in second year of Merneptah year 1233. The defeat of Israel on the stela is the story of Nb. 14, 40. HARTMANN shows Arabian parallels. HAUPT shows a double invasion of Canaan, first by Aramaic speaking Israelites from the Euphrates, circa 1400, then by Edomites, who spoke an Arabic dialect, circa 1050. *Manhu* is Aramaic, not Hebrew; the etymology is a late gloss. This manna is not the honeylike exudation of *tamarix gallica*, of which Sinai produces yearly 500 to 600 pounds only, but the manna-lichen, which may have been mixed with it. The second article identifies this plague with *furunculosis orientalis* (Biskra buttons). HENDERSON places the Exodus of the Rachel tribes in the period of disorder 1215—1200. Merneptah defeated the Leah tribes (Israel stela). Moses knew Akhnaton's failure and yet courageously undertook the same work. HOPPE studies geology of Sinai and gives a good bibliography. JIRKU shows that *ilani* is in that case applied to one god, as Elohim is. He compares the Old Assyrian Law to Mosaic Code. KELSO finds Egyptian influence on Tabernacle structure. KROON says that Exod. 14 is true. LAMBERT explains some passages. LANGDON shows that Hebrews were a branch of Habiri, who first appear as mercenaries in the time of Warad-Sin. He claims (*versus* Luckenbill, AJSL 32, 37) that Habiru mayphilologically be identified with עֲבָרִי. LINDER claims that the song of Ex. 15 is Mosaic. MALLON gives an excellent

survey of the problems: the best complete study of the subject. MAYNARD claims that Yaho was an Ephraimite God, Yahweh his Kenite name which Moses learned and connected with a higher meaning. MERCER finds a multiple Exodus. He compares the Laws of Israel and Assyro-Babylonia including the Assyrian Code. MORGENSTERN reconstructs text of Exod. 3, 1—15. MORITZ interprets the inscriptions of Sinai. OFFORD explains Migdol in Exodus. It is a Semitic name taken over into Egyptian. He studies the plan of a Migdol measured by Clédat (cf. 506) with its square tower and foundation sacrifice. He rejects Willcock's identification of *Yam Suph* with the Sea of Reeds near Pelusium. In the article on the route of the Exodus, he apparently approves Vernes and the Peutinger map against the Kadesh-Barnea-Sinai theory. He maintains Naville's identification of Pithon with Tell-el-Ratabah. Atum symbolised by a lion there explains Gen. 46, 28. This feature went into Salomon's temple. In the last article he says that the massebahs were Solar shrines. PERLES examines Gudemans claims that the Ιαβε of Theodoret is not an argument against it. RANGE and ALT study geology of the Isthmus. RICHTER says that Exod. 4, 24 ff. does not explain why circumcision was performed on children. The wife of Moses acts like a godfather. ROBINSON compares the lump of gold poured by Aaron, and which looked like a calf, to the chance figures made by children. The semi-Canaanite serpent worship of the south and the bull worship of the north were ascribed to Moses and Aaron to justify them. RUBINSTEIN, one-act play. SAYCE sees in the Habiri, mercenaries (not Bedouin) who served as bodyguard to the Hittite governors of the Canaanite cities. SAVIGNAC, good description of the Kadesh region, with photographs. SCHMIDT reconstructs the early Decalogue, without Sabbath; highly artificial. SMITH derives Moses from the Egyptian. TORCZYNER *versus* Gressmann. Sinai is E of the gulf of Akaba, an extinct volcano. In the second article, *versus* Budde, he says that *abîr* never means bull. VÖLTER explains Miriam as "Sea-lover." Inscription 349 does not mention Moses. WADDELL, worthless theory. WATERMAN claims that these laws are a Shechemite contribution from a Joshua cycle later transferred to Moses. WENSINCK shows that the same psychology underlies the modesty of Moses (Ex. 4), of Saul, Jeremiah, and Mohammed's depression at his call. WHATHAM places the Exodus under Seti II. WIENER emends Ex. 4, 16 accord-

ing to the LXX. He defends his Merneptah's date against Whatham. As it is well known that laws are subject to change, he claims that critical theory falls to the ground (as if it were not what the critics said all the time). He argues against Gardiner on the location of Pithom and Raamses. The next article is a fierce attack on Barton. The next claims that Moses imitated Ikhnaton. It has the usual broadsides against the critics, with the same old brass guns. WILSON claims that the text rightly understood does not disprove unity and mosaicity of Pentateuch. WOOD on the value of mosaic hygiene. Cf. also Landesdorfer 393, Sachsse 488, Weill 498, and Jirku 576.

LEVITICUS (INCLUDING LAW)

575. R. S. Galer. *O. T. Law for Bible Students*. 1922, p. 203.
576. A. Jirku. *Hebräische und israelitische Sklaven*. OLZ 1918, 81—83.
577. Kennedy. *Leviticus* 5, 1. ET 29, 561.
578. H. S. Linfield. *The Relation of Jewish to Babylonian Law*. AJSL 36, 40—66.
579. J. Offord. *Land ownership in Ancient Egypt and the Jubilee year*. PEF 1918, 37—39.
580. J. D. Prince. *Note on leprosy in the O. T.* JBL 38, 30—34.
581. H. Schaeffer. *Hebrew Tribal Economy and the Jubilee as illustrated in Semitic and Indo European Village Communities*. 1922, p. 206. Rev. Eissfeldt, TLZ 48, 196—197.
582. Sidersky. *L'origine du mot Nazarenos*. RHR 85, 238—240.
583. A. C. Welch. *The Septuagint Version of Leviticus*. ET 30, 277—278.
584. H. W. Wiener. *The criticism of the Law*. NTS 13, 161—163.
585. R. K. Yerkes. *The unclean animals of Leviticus 11 and Deuteronomy 14*. JQR 14, 1—29.

GALER, as a lawyer, analyses the biblical codes. JIRKU compares Ex. 21, 2 which uses "Hebrew" and Lev. 25, 39 which uses "Israelite." Cf. Dt. 24, 7. Hebrew has a larger extension. KENNEDY emends text. LINFIELD shows direct relation. OFFORD compares to Egyptian land ownership by King. PRINCE finds it real leprosy. With wide information, SCHAEFFER demonstrates that Levitic legislation is old. The Jubilee points to a communal conception of property. SIDERSKY shows that in Lev. 23, 15, sabbath still means

full moon. Nazir means crowned. Jesus was crowned by his disciples. WELCH shows that LXX is less anthropomorphic. YERKES shows five stages in the development of the lists, the D list being the least valuable.

NUMBERS

586. H. C. Ackerman. *Concerning the nature of Balaam's vision.* ATR 2, 233—234.
587. F. Field. *O. T. Revision Notes.* ET 32, 140.
588. A. Jirku. *Wo stand ursprünglich die Notiz über Hebron in Num. 13, 22?* ZAW 39, 312—313.
589. M. Lambert. *Notes lexicographiques et exégétiques.* REJ 70, 209—210, 213.
590. J. Meinhold. *Textkonjekturen.* ZAW 38, 170—171.
591. G. Richter. *Die Einheitlichkeit der Geschichte der Rotte Korah.* Nu. 16, ZAW 39, 128—137.
592. J. Scheftelowitz. *Das Opfer der roten Kuh.* Nu. 19, ZAW 39, 113—122.
593. M. H. Segal. *The Settlement of Manasseh East of Jordan.* PEF 1918, 124—131.
594. H. W. Wiener. *The text of Numbers XXI.* 14f., BS 1918, 232—234.
595. P. Winterbotham. *The City of Refuge.* Exp. 23, 1922, 32—40.

ACKERMAN shows similarity to prophetic visions. FIELD's textual notes for RV. JIRKU says that notice was originally at the close of Gen. 13. LAMBERT emends text in Nb. 6, 26 and shows that part of the story in Nb. 20, 2—13 was lost. MEINHOLD emends text in Nb. 24. The story of Nb. 16 is one according to RICHTER. The rite of the red cow is apotropeic, says SCHEFTELOWITZ, and a survival of a non-monotheistic foreign ritual. SEGAL, *versus* Driver, HDB III, 232, opposed re-emigration theory. WINTERBOTHAM studies in Nb. 35, 9—32, a Lynch law, and the religious feeling about sanctity of human life. Blood desecrates the earth because of this last notion.

DEUTERONOMY

596. K. Budde. *Das Lied Moses Deut. 32, erläutert und übersetzt.* 1920, p. 50. Rev. Baumgärtel, TLB 41, 338—339.
597. — *Zu Deut. 32, 43.* JBL 40, 38—39.

598. K. Budde. *Der Segen Mose's, erläutert und übersetzt*. 1922, p. 50. Rev. Nowack, TLZ 48, 6; Stummer, OLZ 26, 328; Eissfeldt, DLZ 1924, 334—335.
599. F. C. Burkitt. *The Code Found in the Temple*. JBL 40, 166—167.
600. W. Caspari. *Weltreichbegebenheiten bei den Deuteronomisten?* OLZ 27, 8—10.
601. Eichroth. *Bahnt sich eine neue Lösung der deuteronomischen Frage an?* NKZ 32, 1921, 41—78.
602. H. J. Elhorst. *Eine verkannte Zauberhandlung*. Deut. 21, 1—9, ZAW 39, 58—67.
603. — *Die deuteronomischen Jahresfeste*. ZAW 42, 136—145.
604. F. Field. *O. T. Revision Notes*. ET 32, 140.
605. A. Freed. *The code spoken of in 2 Kings 22—23*. JBL 47, 76—80.
606. H. H. Gowen. *The outstretched arm*. ATR 3, 74—77.
607. G. Hölscher. *Komposition und Ursprung des Deuteronomiums*. ZAW 40, 161—255. Cf. Expos. 1924, I, 230.
608. F. H. Horst. *Die Kultusreform des Königs Josia (II. Reg. 22—23)*. Rev. Eissfeldt, TLZ 49, 224—225.
609. M. Kegel. *Die Kultus-Reformation des Josia. Die Aussagen der mod. Kritik über II Reg. 22, 23, kritisch beleuchtet*. 1919, p. 133. Rev. Löhr, OLZ 24, 212; Nowack, TLZ 45, 195—196; Wiener, BS 1921, 113—117.
610. R. H. Kennett. *Deuteronomy and the Decalogue*. 1920. Rev. Burkitt, JThS 22, 61—65; Maynard, ATR 4, 173.
611. G. Kittel. *Sifre zu Deuteronomium*. I. Lieferung 1922, p. 144. Rev. Staerk, TLZ 224—225.
612. E. König. *Ist Jahwe im A. T. irgendwo als Untergott gemeint?* ZAW 40, 68—74.
613. M. Lambert. *Notes lexicographiques et exégétiques*. REJ 70, p. 92 and p. 210—212.
614. D. D. Luckenbill. *The "Wandering Aramean"*. AJSL 36, 244—245.
615. M. L. Margolis. *Le'is hasideka, Deut. 33—38*. JBL 38, 35—42.
616. K. Marti. *Zu Deut. 32, 10*. ZAW 39, 315—316.
617. J. Meinhold. *Textkonjekturen (Deut. 33, 6)*. ZAW 38, 171.
618. S. A. B. Mercer. *The little man of his eye, Deut. 32, 10*. ATR 3, 151—152.

619. T. Östreicher. *Das deuteronomische Grundgesetz*. 1923. Rev. Hemmel, TLB 45, 129—132; Sellin, Th. Geg. 17, 111—114.
620. C. R. Smith. *The priest preachers of Jerusalem*. Exp. 26, 255—258.
621. G. A. Smith. *The book of Deuteronomy*. 1918, p. 518. Rev. Barnes, JThS 20, 82—83; Calès, Rech. d. Sc. Rel. 1921, 105—110; Gordon, AJRh 24, 296—299; König, TLB 41 97—99; Lagrange RB 1919, 564—568; Podechard, Rev. Sc. R., 2, 164—169.
622. W. Spiegelberg. *Zur Datierung des Deuteronomiums*. OLZ 26, 481—482.
623. C. Steuernagel. *Das Deuteronomium*. 1923, Sellin, Theol. Geg. 17, 116—117.
624. A. C. Welch. *Miscelle*. ZAW 42, 163—164.
625. H. W. Wiener. *The main problem of Deuteronomy*. BS 77, 46—82.

BUDDE emends text in masterly fashion. In JBL he answers to a criticism of Gunkel in OLZ 1920, 782ff. The third article studies Deut. 33 in the same way. BURKITT—D is exilic. CASPARI *versus* 621. EICHRODT, D is a product rather than a cause of Josiah's Reformation. ELHORST says that this rite was taken from the Canaanites. FIELD's RV translation notes. FREED maintains the code is D, *versus* Berry. GOWEN compares this Deuteronomistic idiom with other literatures. HÖLSCHER, D later than Josiah, than H and Ezekiel's code. HORST, same point of view. KEGEL says that the code found was not D only. He comes a bit late in the field to fight his battle. BURKITT, D is post exilic. KITTEL edits a rabbinical commentary of the second century A. D. KÖNIG *versus* Budde on Deut. 32, 8—9. LAMBERT emends text in Deut. 2; 28, 29, 32. LUCKENBILL illustrates Deut. 26, 5 from Sennacherib's Prism 5, 11. MARGOLIS defends text of Deut. 33, 8. It is not a Maccabean interpolation. MARTI and MEINHOLD emend text. MERCER explains by Egyptian. ÖSTREICHER, double source in 2 Kings story. Code found is not D. C. R. SMITH shows that D is product of long growth. There were two kinds of preachers, priestly and prophetic. G. A. SMITH reëdits Deut. for the Cambridge Bible; shows influence of Hosea and Isaiah on Deut.; maintains it between E and P. SPIEGELBERG, says that D is post exilic on the basis, of Deut. 11, 4 which alludes to the conquest of Egypt by Cambyases

in 525. STEUERNAGEL 2nd edition. WELCH on 601 shows that v. 5 which embarrassed Elhorst really supports his point of view. WIENER claims mosaic authorship. Ikhnaton prepared the way before Moses. Text is handled with his usual vim. Cf. also Albright 428, Schlögl 32 (where Deut. 12—26 is taken to be a post exilic reworking of an outline of Mosaic Law read at the feast of Tabernacles in the sabbatical years), and Yerkes 585.

REVIEWS

Historical Inscriptions, Containing Principally the Chronological Prism, W-B. 444. By S. Langdon. New York: Oxford University Press, 1923, pp. 36, pls. VII. \$ 3.35.

This is Volume II of the *Oxford Editions of Cuneiform Texts*, edited by Professor Langdon, Professor of Assyriology in Oxford University. This is one of the most important chronological texts in Cuneiform ever published. In making use of the new material here presented for the first time Dr. Langdon acknowledges the difficulty of determining the date of the first Babylonian dynasty, and points out that the dates given for the entire chronology of ancient Sumer and Accad rest upon the point from which the calculations begin, the year of the founding of the Hammurabi dynasty. For the time being, he has accepted the year 2225 for the beginning of that dynasty, and 2357 for the beginning of the Isin dynasty, being the dates of Kugler. These dates are regarded by Professor Fotheringham of Oxford as 56 years too high.

As an introduction to his translations Professor Langdon presents an interesting and instructive discussion of the Sumero-Accadian system of legendary and historical chronology in which he shows that the prism herein published purports to give the dynastic list of the kings of Sumer and Accad from the antediluvian period to the end of the reign of Sin-magir, thirteenth king of Isin. He institutes an interesting comparison between this list and that of Berossus, in which he seeks to show that the Berossian list depends indirectly upon the early Sumero-Accadian list.

Then come the transliteration and the translation of the Chronological Prism, which is done with Langdon's usual learning and accuracy. In the summary on page 26 "twelfth year of Sinmuballit" should be read instead of "twenty-third."

The next text is a historical inscription of Sin-idinam, ninth king of the dynasty of Ellasar, who ruled from 2181 to 2176 B.C., and the third is a tablet of annals of the reign of Hammurabi

written "in the spirit of a thoughtful historian." The three texts are clearly autographed, and the whole book places us still further in the debt of Professor Langdon, who is doing such splendid pioneer work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Annals of Sennacherib. By Daniel David Luckenbill. University of Chicago Press, 1924, pp. XI, 196. \$ 4.00.

In 1920 the Oriental Museum of the University of Chicago acquired a perfect copy of the Prism of Sennacherib. It was then decided to publish a new edition of the text which eventually grew into this new publication of the Oriental Institute. It is interesting to notice that this volume shows a return to the method of presentation of Assyrian material inaugurated by George Smith. The sources are grouped first as military expeditions, then construction of "the Palace without a rival," of the *bitkutalli*, or armory, of the Temple of the New Year's feast, of various buildings. The final chapter gives excerpts from the Babylonian Chronicle and the Hellenistic sources. The transliterations of cuneiform texts follow the system adopted for the Assyro-Babylonian Dictionary now being prepared by the Oriental Institute. The new prism is given in autographed text, which is so clear as well as so similar to the signs as they actually are on the clay that we think that this volume should be the best book to use as a "Reader" in cuneiform. The discussion of the history of the reign of Sennacherib is excellent. It is sober, interesting, well balanced, and avoids startling effects. The translation is as good as any one can make it now in the present inchoate state of Assyrian lexicography. Dr. Luckenbill himself tells me that, owing to a slip of memory he kept the old translation battering ram for *arammu* (p. 32 l. 21) although the meaning ramp was certain from Babyl. Exped. Vol. X. No. 2, 1. We trust that this fine volume of historical records will soon be followed by others.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

The Assyrian Herbal. By R. Campbell Thompson. London: Luzac and Co., 1924, pp. XXVII+294.

This book, the subject matter of which was communicated in a paper to the Royal Society on March 20th, 1924, is a study

of ancient Assyrian vegetable drugs. The study is based on about 120 fragments of cuneiform plant lists, 660 medical tablets in the author's own *Assyrian Medical Texts*, and on previous publications of medical texts, full reference to which are to be found in Thompson's *Assyrian Medical Texts*.

In this work the author has discussed about 250 plants in the Assyrian Herbal. His method in doing this has been to make a tabulated list of the occurrences of these drugs in the 660 tablets referred to above, to show the relative popularity, rarity or other factor of the 250 vegetable drugs in use; to use the plant-list of CT XIV to secure the synonyms and equivalents for the different plants; to arrange in order of their frequency the drugs given in the Index of Budge's *Syriac Book of Medicines*; and finally to co-ordinate and apply the data thus secured by comparison with the modern flora of Mesopotamia, and with the drugs of Oriental and Classical writers, as well as with those in the modern Pharmacopoeias.

In carrying out this method the author has arranged his material in the following manner: (1) A table of proportionate occurrences of the drugs in the 660 tablets of the *Assyrian Medical Texts*; (2) A list of all the vegetable drugs occurring more than five times in the *Assyrian Medical Texts*, with the number of times they occur, and the order of their frequency; (3) The Botanical order according to certain semi-medical lists; (4) Notes on the borrowing of Assyrian plant-names into the language of the west, and remarks on the methods of the Assyrian scribes in their botanical works; (5) Critical notes to the author's copies of the plant-lists in CT XIV; (6) The chief plant-lists in CT XIV in transliteration; (7) Notes and identifications of the drugs in CT XIV with their use in medicine; (8) The gums and gum-resins; (9) The trees; (10) Various plants; and (11) The ŠE groups. In accordance with this arrangement the author then carries out his work. The subject is a highly specialized one, and Mr. Thompson has no equal in this field, in fact no one who can at all be placed in the same class with himself. It is therefore difficult for anyone else to review such a work. However, the present reviewer has read with the greatest care what Thompson has written in this book, and has found the author's reasoning to be sound and sane. These pages are packed with rare learning and expert knowledge. Here

and there inferences are drawn which may not turn out to be true, but Thompson has always indicated uncertain statements. The next 41 pages consist of a series of most useful indices. The first is an Assyrian index with full reference to the text; then we are given a Sumerian index; then Syriac; then Hebrew and Aramaic; next Arabic and Persian; then Greek; next Latin; and finally English with two Indian terms, and a few references from the Bible.

The copies of two early Assyrian tablets of plant-lists in CT XXXVII by Mr. Sidney Smith furnished material for a long Addenda, packed full of instructive material, in which, among many other things, the author shows the possible linguistic relationship between our "asafoetida" and the Sumerian AŠ.

The whole book has been autographed, an immense piece of work. There are very few pages where any difficulty has been experienced in reading the autograph—although this has happened now and then, for example, p. XVII. Thompson has placed all students of Assyrian deeply in his debt. His book is not one to be read in a comfortable arm-chair at a few readings. It is a great reference book, the very best—in fact the only real work—on the subject. It is only to be regretted that funds were not forthcoming for the printing of such an epoch-making book in the study of ancient Oriental medicine.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Assyrian Medical Texts. By R. Campbell Thompson. London: John Bale, Sons and Danielsson, 1924. Reprint from the *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 1924, Vol. XVII, Section of the History of Medicine, pp. 1—34. 2/6.

Herein Mr. Thompson begins his translations of the Medical Texts of the British Museum, published by him in his *Assyrian Medical Texts*. His first section consists of those texts that have to do with diseases of the head, and gives in translation, with critical notes, 25 of these texts. His second section deals with diseases of the eyes and he has given here a long and most interesting text. Further translations will appear, it is hoped, as soon as possible. Thompson's notes are full of instructive comparisons and comments on all phases of Oriental medicine.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Assyrian Medical Texts from the Originals in the British Museum. By R. Campbell Thompson. London: Oxford University Press, 1923, pp. VII + pls. 107. 2.2.0 net.

The 660 cuneiform medical tablets, so accurately copied on the 107 plates of this book, belong to the seventh century B.C., but are copies of older texts. Most of them are published herein for the first time.

In the preface Mr. Thompson discusses previous and proposed works on Assyrian medical texts, and traces his own interest and work along this line. Mr. Thompson has been engaged on these tablets off and on for the last eighteen years, and has now brought his studies to a successful issue, having issued his splendid *Assyrian Herbal*, as well as a beginning in the translation of the texts contained in this volume.

There are in the texts in this volume numerous duplicates which will be indicated in the translations.

The tablets are indexed according to their British Museum numbers and their numbers in this book. The autographing has been most carefully done, a few errors having been noted by the author himself, and corrected in an Errata et Addenda.

In studying these texts the author estimates that about 250 species of vegetable drugs were used by the Assyrians in the seventh century B.C. Of these, about 38 have been previously identified and the author himself has now identified a similar number. Among the new identifications are *Ash*, a form of *asa-foetida*; *Dilbat*, the daisy; *nurmû*, pomegranite; *Karshu*, cherry; and *musukkanu*, mulberry. Students of Assyrian medicine await with interest the author's translations. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus. By T. Eric Peet. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1923, pp. 136, pls. 22. 63/— net.

In 1877 Dr. August Eisenlohr of Heidelberg published his great work, *Ein mathematisches Handbuch der alten Ägypter*. Since 1877 new mathematical manuscripts have been discovered, for example, the New York fragments, the Kahun fragments, the Berlin fragments, and the Moscow papyrus, and now in 1923 Professor Peet has issued a new edition of this great papyrus in the light of more recent discoveries, and has abundantly shown

by his work what great strides Egyptology has made since the days of Eisenlohr. Professor Peet has given us a new translation of this important papyrus with a full commentary and introduction. He has transcribed the hieratic into hieroglyphic and undoubtedly has his reasons for doing so, though one wonders why he did not copy the hieratic as Eisenlohr did.

The introduction is a splendid piece of scholarly work. He first gives a history of the work which has been done on the papyrus from the time of Lenormant in 1867. Then comes a description of the papyrus, in which it is shown how the new fragments are used to supply some missing parts. In his discussion of the date of the papyrus Peet thinks that the scribe's statement may be taken at its face value, and that the present papyrus copied between 1788 and 1580 B. C. represents an original of about 1849 to 1801 B. C. This is followed by an account of the contents of the papyrus, in which the translator reminds us that it is not a mathematical treatise in the modern sense but consists of a number of examples. The next section of the introduction is very valuable, for it contains an account of those documents that are available for the study of Egyptian mathematics. This will be found of the greatest value by students of ancient mathematics. Then the date and origin of Egyptian mathematics are discussed, where Peet shows the main discoveries of mathematics should be dated to the Old Kingdom. He then proceeds to show the simple and intensely practical character of Egyptian mathematics, showing that it had no means of dealing with fractions whose numerators were greater than unity. The Egyptian system of notation was exceedingly cumbrous, although it was a decimal system, but it had one virtue, namely, it was admirably suited for multiplication and division by 10. The square and square root were known to the Egyptians as was also the equation, as well as mathematical and geometrical progression. The areas of the square and rectangle were correctly estimated, and the volume of the cube and rectangular paralleliped was known. A long section is devoted to the Egyptian method of setting out the sums, and this is most interesting, for the various technical Egyptian phrases are given and discussed. They can be further found in the index, where, by the way, *ist* may be rendered by "portion." A brief discussion of Egyptian weights and measures is wisely given, where an

interesting comment is made on the sacred-eye myth of the Egyptians. The last section of the introduction deals with a comparison of Egyptian mathematics with Babylonian, with a few paragraphs on what the Greeks knew about Egyptian mathematics. This section is particularly instructive.

The translation and commentary cover one hundred and eighteen large pages. Both have been admirably done, although there are some passages where a decided difference of opinion may be expressed, such, for example, as that which the translator says on No. 41, on page 81, or No. 69, on page 115, last paragraph.

The plates have been splendidly transcribed not from the British Museum Facsimiles but from the original papyri themselves. This was a very wise precaution! Professor Peet is to be warmly congratulated on his fine piece of work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Ornamentik der Ägyptischen Wollwirkereien. Von M. Dimand. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924, pp. 76, pls. XVIII, illus. 74. \$ 2.88, bound \$ 3.48.

A great deal has been written on Egyptian art in general, but very little has been done in the matter of a study of ornamentation. The book before us is an attempt to study such ornamentation on the basis of most recent material. A scholarly introduction deals with the literature of the subject and the background of Egyptian culture and civilization. The next division of the book treats of the development of wall draperies, which, as the author observes, were often used originally for mortuary shrouds. The technique of Egyptian woollens is described in a long and learned chapter by Vivi Sylwan, a Swedish textile expert. Section four is devoted to a study of figured ornamentation, but in section five the heart of the subject is reached and it is a splendid piece of expert work. Section six deals with foreign influence, and the last section, with durability of the coloured ornamentation. The whole work is splendidly illustrated, and with its full index, should remain for many years a solid reference book in its field.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Lettre à M. Dacier relative à l'alphabet des Hiéroglyphes phonétiques par M. Champollion le jeune. Édition du Centenaire par

Henri Sottas. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1922, pp. 84 + 52, pls. 4. Frs. 25.

There are two good reasons for the hope that this little book may be widely circulated. First, it contains in reprint the famous letter of Champollion to Dacier, with four magnificent facsimile plates of Champollion's great discoveries; and, secondly, the letter is preceded by an introduction or preface of 84 pages by M. Sottas, in which the nature and character of Champollion's work are clearly described, and in which M. Sottas demonstrates the superiority of Champollion's work to that of Young. M. Sottas has accomplished his task in a spirit of fairness and tolerance. Whether Champollion was destined from infancy, as Sottas remarks, to accomplish his great work may be open to doubt, but that the great work of decipherment belongs peculiarly to Champollion no one can now well doubt.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die Religion und Kunst von El-Amarna. Von Heinrich Schäfer. Berlin: Julius Bard, 1923, pp. 66, pls. 7. Mk. 1.25.

In this brief outline of the religion of El-Amarna, Schäfer indicates that the word *atôn* was already used in reference to the sun in the time of Amenophis III, but that it was Ikhnaton who gave it fuller religious content, and as early as the fourth year of his reign determined to build a new city where the *atôn* could in purity be worshipped—the source of all light, life, love, and truth. In illustrating the great change which was brought about by Ikhnaton's repudiation of Amon and his adoption of Atôn, Schäfer has reproduced two pictures of the Vizir Ramose, one representing the Amon regime, the other the El-Amarna religion. The contrast is striking. The second picture breathes an atmosphere of simplicity and naturalness entirely absent from the first. The revolution which Ikhnaton accomplished is seen nowhere more clearly than in the El-Amarna art. The little book ends with a translation of the famous Hymn to the Sun. Schäfer's knowledge of Egyptian art makes this little book of great value.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Kunstwerke aus El-Amarna. Von Heinrich Schäfer. Berlin: Julius Bard, 1923, 2 Bde. Mk. 1.60.

The art of El-Amarna has been known since 1850 through the work of Lepsius. But very little attention was paid to it until 1891—2 when Petrie began his excavation at El-Amarna. In 1906 the *Deutsche Orient-Gesellschaft* under Borchardt began excavations which are now carried on by the *Egypt Exploration Society*. These two little books give us a very good idea of the art of El-Amarna as recovered by Borchardt.

The first volume consists of 16 plates with explanations. The frontispiece is the famous head of Nofretête. The second volume has also 16 plates, the frontispiece being a statue of Ikhnaton. These illustrations of the art of El-Amarna will be found of first-rate importance by the student of Egyptian art, religion and civilization.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

The Living Pageant of the Nile. By R. F. Wilson. Illustrated by E. F. Ward. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1923, pp. 240.



This book is not for the trained Egyptologist. It was written by a news-paper reporter who has attempted to give a glimpse of the living pageant enacted in Egypt thirty-five hundred years ago. Mr. Wilson has read much and observed more. He has written a dramatic, rich, and colourful account of some of the most important events in Egyptian history.

The story of Egypt is told with all the liveliness of a modern reporter—not always accurate (read pages 11—20), but with a good deal of interesting detail. It is rather irritating to be told that Rameses II until recent years “was regarded as the Pharaoh of the Exodus of the Hebrews,” but it is amusing to note the author’s obliviousness of all problems, for example, when he speaks of Seti II as the Pharaoh of the Exodus.

The story of Hatshepsut is told with a good deal of imagination, although fairly true to what is historically known. Chapter four, “In Tutankhamen’s Time” is very well done, as are also the next two chapters. The most interesting part of the book, at least to the present reviewer, consists of the last two chapters, “Digging History,” and “The Archaeologist’s Ways”—the latter is full of useful information. This is one of the best popular books to which the discovery of Tutankhamen’s tomb has given rise.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Beiträge zur Geschichte der altägyptischen Baukunst. Von Fr. W. von Bissing (Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akd. d. W. 1923, 7), München, 1923, pp. 16.

With a beautiful drawing by E. v. Bissing and two photographs, this little monograph consists of five interesting notes, one of which shows that the sign  indicates a small chapel, another describes a residence of several stories, another discusses the form of the oldest sanctuaries, a fourth describes the chapel of the New Year in the Temples of Edfu and Dendera, and the last sketches in an interesting manner the Temple of Sethi II at Karnak. Von Bissing sees in the sign  a flag before the temple.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

A Century of Excavation in the Land of the Pharaohs. By James Baikie. London: The Religious Tract Society, n. d., pp. 252.

There is no student of Egyptology who, at some time or other, has not deplored the lack of a brief but reliable account of excavation in Egypt. This has now been done—and done well—not only accurately, but charmingly. No one has succeeded as has Mr. Baikie in making archaeology a fascinating thing. These eight chapters are gems. The story of the pioneers—how they live and how they inspire! Then the great work of Mariette is described, and then the modern period begins. The pyramids and their explorers come in for a clear discussion and description, then the temples and royal tombs, and then Tutankhamen himself in all his splendour. The last chapter gives a vivid résumé of our knowledge of life, arts, and crafts in the land of the Nile. There are thirty-two illustrations and a good index. For those who are interested in the wonders of Egypt no more illuminating pages can be found anywhere than pages 66—67, 74—75, 78, 84, 94—95, 100—103 of this book. Over-statements or mis-statements are very rare, even in a semi-popular book. Reference should be made, however, to the assumption of funeral sacrifices (p. 142), to the statement about “the creed of the Brotherhood of Man” (171), and to the estimate of art (p. 243). These are all debatable questions. But on the whole, this book can be recommended as the very best existing guide to a history of Egyptian excavation.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Fragmentary Coptic Hymns from the Wadi n-Natrun. Edited with translations and notes by De Lacy O'Leary. London: Luzac & Co., 1924, pp. 60. 10/6.

These fragments belong to the literary material found by the New York Metropolitan Museum Expedition in the Dar Abu Makar in the Wadi n-Natrun in 1920—1921. Most of it is published here for the first time. The material represents various periods from the 15th to the 18th centuries. The originals are now deposited in the library of the Coptic Museum in Old Cairo. There are 44 of these fragments, all of which are herein translated. One of the most interesting of these is a Hymn on the Resurrection. The critical and exegetical notes are very valuable. Dr. O'Leary's translations are excellent.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Die altelamischen Steininschriften. Von Carl Frank. Berlin: Karl Curtius, 1923, pp. 16, pls. 8. Mk. 3.

Dr. Frank herein makes a new attempt to decipher the old Elamitic inscriptions of the third millennium B. C. His first attempt was made in 1912. There are nine inscriptions, and each one is transliterated, translated and given in facsimile. His sign list covers three pages. Has not the 41 sign the value of *ik*? Sign 3 may also be *ni*. Sign 4 may be compared to the Old Chinese *wang* = king. Has sign 6 the value of *ja*, and sign 55 the value of *sa*? Frank's decipherment seems to be reasonable and likely.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Oriental Forerunners of Byzantine Painting. By James Henry Breasted. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1924, pp. 105, pls. XXIII. \$ 4.00 net.

The publications of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago could not have had a more propitious beginning. In this the first volume we have a contribution to our knowledge of the ancient Nearer Orient of the first rank. The discovery herein described throws a penetrating light upon many questions in Oriental science and it also raises new and perplexing ones which will provoke abundant discussion.

In April of 1920, on his return to Baghdad from the upper Tigris, as leader of the Mesopotamian expedition of the Oriental

Institute of the University of Chicago, Professor Breasted received an invitation from the British military authorities at Baghdad to undertake an archaeological mission up the Euphrates on their behalf. From them he received some papers, among which was a despatch addressed to Colonel Leachman and signed by Captain M. C. Murphy, dated March 31st, 1920, which stated that on the 30th of March he (Captain Murphy) had discovered at Şâlihîyah some ancient wall paintings in a wonderful state of preservation. Professor Breasted immediately saw the importance of this discovery, and accepting the invitation of the British Command at Baghdad immediately set out for Şâlihîyah, up the Euphrates. The first-century wall paintings from the fortress of Dura (Şâlihîyah), a lost city on the outskirts of the Roman Empire in Asia, were the wall paintings discovered by Captain Murphy and made known to the world by Professor Breasted.

In an introduction to Breasted's vivid account of his expedition to Şâlihîyah, Franz Cumont, the famous French Syriologist, points out the great importance of this discovery, first, in the matter of our knowledge of the political history of ancient Syria, then, concerning our knowledge of the history of Oriental religion, and, finally, in respect to our knowledge of the history of art.

Chapter one is devoted to a history of Şâlihîyah and the Mid-Euphrates Kingdom of Khana-Mari, in which Breasted shows the identification of Şâlihîyah with the ancient Dura whose history he traces from about 3000 B. C., when Eannatum, king of Lagash, was overlord of Mari, through Babylonian, Assyrian, Persian, Greek, and Roman history, down to the time of Constantine (324—337), when a Christian ascetic was found dwelling as a hermit in its ruins. The present name Şâlihîyah is due to the fact that the Arabs, wandering in from the desert, naturally associated such a fortress as that of ancient Dura with the memories of their heroic Saladin, and called it Şâlihîyah, "place of Salah," from Şalâh ed-Dîn (Saladin). The discovery of this ancient fortress has not only contributed essentially to our knowledge of the development of art in Europe, but has also revealed to us something of the history of the ancient Kingdom of Khana-Mari.

The second chapter describes the discovery of the paintings which are so wonderfully illustrated in this volume, which now,

on account of Arab vandalism, is "the capital source of knowledge of this important piece of discovery."

Among other things these pictures depict a Roman tribune engaged in the worship of what seems like three statues of Roman emperors painted on the wall.

Chapter three describes the city and fortress of Dura, the fortress being of pre-Roman, perhaps Parthian date. Chapter four gives an account of the Temple of Zeus-Baal in the fortress, and the last chapter gives in detail an account of the wall paintings and inscriptions of the temple.

Professor Breasted is not only a lucky man in having the freedom and backing which help him in his many epoch-making contributions to Oriental science, but he has the rare ability of putting into pure and telling English his descriptions. Compare the description of his wonderful single-day's work, after his dash up the Euphrates, and the way in which he carried his mission through to completion! The whole book is brilliantly written and beautifully illustrated with twenty-three plates, four of which are in colour, and fifty-eight text figures. This sumptuous, authoritative work augurs well for the future of the *Oriental Institute Publications*.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

L'art islamique en Orient. By A. M. Raymond. Librairie Raymond, Pera, Constantinople. 2nd part, pp. 12, pls. 61. \$ 20.

In this most artistic publications the author studies religious and civic architecture at Koniah, Brussa, Isnik, Stambul &c. The monuments (mosques, hammams, madrasses, and turbehs) date from the thirteenth to the sixteenth century. Mr. Raymond gives not only coloured drawings of buildings but also of doors, windows, knockers, iron railings. All the plates are explained in the text. The preface calls attention to the real value of Islamic culture and especially of modern Near East art which Mr. Raymond knows so well. The publication of this magnificent work was made possible by the generosity of the Hon. C. R. Crané who is to be congratulated for investing money so as to make us all his debtors.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Vocabulaire pratique du dialecte arabe centre africain. By R. Derendiger. Paris: Tournon, 1923, pp. 187.

Lieutenant-Colonel Derendiger wrote fourteen years ago a good article on the Arabic spoken in the region of Lake Tchad. He now publishes a handbook of the language for the use of travellers unacquainted with philology or with Arabic grammar. The first part of the book is a short but well arranged grammar, the second part a French-Arabic vocabulary, the third an Arabic-French vocabulary, the fourth gives some sentences for conversation. Purists will criticize the author's transcription because it confounds a number of different consonants, but his system is good enough for the average traveller. The grammar of the region is terribly decayed, but as such very interesting because of its mixture as semi-classical and purely African forms. The author gives us quite evidently a market or barrack language which is far from respectable and would not be understood in North Africa or in Egypt. The Tchad dialects differ so much from the Moghrebi dialects and from Hassanieh that it is quite evident that there was no great amount of intercourse between this region and North Africa, but rather with Egypt. The author is to be complimented for giving us the true vernacular, and for avoiding the classical forms which any native with some pretension to scholarship will pretend to be the correct forms. What we want, and what we have in a work of this kind is, the plain, unvarnished colloquial.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

La Nouvelle Turquie. By Berthe Georges-Gaulis. Paris: Colin, 1924.

Madame Georges-Gaulis has had the best opportunities to study the new Turkey. Her book is probably the best that has been written on the lamentable situation created in the Near East by a certain kind of European imperialism. It is the work of a witness who saw Asia Minor and Constantinople as no other European saw it, and who also spent a good deal of time at Lausanne, observing keenly, and now, is speaking without fear. The author describes the horrors perpetrated by the Greek army in Asia Minor, and shows that the fire at Smyrna was part of the same scheme. She brings us into living contact with those great men, Mustapha Kemal, Ismet pacha, Raefet pacha. She is rather

opposed to the British. We think that she did not understand the value of a man like Sir Charles A. Harington, nor did she give him his due, for averting another world war. The author shows how French politicians were singularly devoid of vision in dealing with the new Turkey. Americans interested in the Near East should do well to read this book, especially in connection with the books equally true written by Clair Price and Alexander Powell. If they are interested in missionary work, they will probably lament the fact that the leaders of missionary enterprise in the Near East have dealt with the new Turkey, in a manner as unenlightened and near-sighted as the French politicians.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Essai sur les procédés littéraires dont il paraît que Moïse s'est servi pour composer le livre de la Genèse. Fasc. I. By D. Devimeux. Paris: Geuthner, 1923, pp. 127.

Under this title which recalls that of Astruc's famous book, Mr. Devimeux defends quite a different point of view. He does not accept, nor even consider at all, the "documentary hypothesis." He would rather follow the principle of Fustel de Coulanges, and take the text alone as the basis of study (as if every critic did not claim to do exactly the same). Mr. Devimeux believes that the stories of Genesis, and even the genealogies are metrical. On the basis of the popular poetry of the Christians of Syriac rite living near Mosul, he defends the theory that lines of poetry may be very irregular in length. They sometimes have only *one* accented syllable. The author follows the strophic system of D. H. Müller, as modified by Zenner. For him the strophic thought is really a poetical phrase. When the antistrophy and the strophy happen to differ lightly owing to the inclusion of an incidental line, which is similar to the neuma in plainsong, rhythm or melody can be suspended without being broken. The author believes that the biblical poems were sung and that there was in them, as in Syriac popular poetry, a similarity between the beginning and the end of the strophy (*inclusio*). The *responsio*, a form of repetition, is also used by Syriac poets. Besides, the choir leader often sings by himself a line out of the poetical measure. The author believes that besides the parallelism of lines

there is also an intrastrophic and interstrophic parallelism. Although Mr. Devimeux leaves us unconvinced of the existence of metrical lines of one accented syllable, and although much of his interstrophic parallelism seems artificial, we are looking forward to the publication of the rest of his work on Genesis. We fail to see that his theory has any bearing on the "documentary" hypothesis. It certainly does not disprove it, as we understand it to-day.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Du Genre Grammatical en Sémitique. Par M. Féghali et A. Cuny. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1924. Fr. 10.

This little book has been written in a detailed way about the grammatical gender in Semitic languages. It is designed to emphasise the problem, and to call the attention of Semitic scholars to it. In doing so the authors and their publisher have done valliant service. The table on pages 82f. is of prime importance, and the conclusions arrived at should be carefully noted. Among them is the fact that originally Semitic languages had only one form for masculine and feminine. This phenomenon could have been further illustrated by the structure of early languages such as Sumerian. The little book is well worth while.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Das Hauptproblem des Deuteronomiums. Von Harold M. Wiener. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1924, pp. 56.

This is a German translation of Wiener's *The Main Problem of Deuteronomy*, and contains the author's well-known thesis. Whether one agrees with Mr. Wiener or not, his works on the Pentateuch and other Old Testament studies cannot for a moment be neglected.

In the *Nieuwe Theologische Studien* Wiener again puts forth in an article "The Present Position of the Pentateuchal Question," his "library theory" to account for misplacements in the Pentateuch.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

מעשה הכתב בדורו של משה By R. Eisler. Pp. 24, pls. 2.

This reprint of the Hebrew magazine *Debir* is more than an attempt to popularize the conclusions reached by Dr. Eisler; it

contains other material as well. The author shows what results had been reached by critics until Petrie published the Sinaitic inscriptions. He translates several inscriptions and compares them with hieroglyphic. The problem is evidently not nearly solved but Eisler has so far made the best contribution to it.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Descriptive Catalogue of Genizah Fragments in Philadelphia. By B. Halper. Philadelphia: Dropsie College, 1924, pp. 235. \$ 3.00.

There has been coming to light steadily for the past number of years a huge mass of Jewish literature in fragmentary form. These cannot yet be all published for obvious reasons. But they should at least be catalogued and the catalogues should be published. Dropsie College has begun to do its share of this task, making the fourth such catalogue, the other three being those of the Bodleian, the British Museum, and Elkan N. Adler. This catalogue confines itself to a description of the Genizah fragments extant in Philadelphia.

This catalogue records 487 fragments, divided in the following way: Bible 74, Talmud, Midrash and Halakah 93, Liturgy 145, Secular Poetry 19, Documents and Letters 96, Philosophy and Kabbalah 15, and Miscellaneous 45.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

Marduk von Babylon und Jesus Christus. By A. Kirchner. M. Gladbach: Volkereins. Verlag Gmbh., 1922, pp. 144.

This is a contribution to apologetics on the basis of comparative religion, more especially of Babylonian religion. The work is basically an attack against Zimmern's views. The author studies first the problem of evil and the concept of redemption in Babylonian religion. He basis his conclusions on quotations from *Enuma eliš* and from incantations and hymns already well known. No attempt is made to trace a development of thought from early Sumerian religion. In the second part the author studies the biblical teaching of evil and redemption and in the third he compares it to Babylonian conceptions. He shows that the notion of sin is incidental in Babylonia, but fundamental in the biblical conception of evil. Hence redemption is in Babylonia

purely physical while in the Bible the moral element is emphasized. The uniqueness of Christ does not suffer from any comparison with Marduk or Tammuz. Dr. Kirchner's book is well written; the information on which it is based is accurate. The new text on the Passion of Marduk, as it was interpreted by Zimmern, is discussed with great acumen. If one could prove a direct relation between Babylonian religion and some of the mystery religions, Dr. Kirchner's book would cease to be to the point. Until then, the burden of the proof is on the other side.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Bibliography of African Christian Literature. By F. Rowling and C. E. Wilson. London: Conference of Missionary Societies of Great Britain and Ireland, 1923, pp. 151, and map.

This survey, being practical in its aim, does not include obsolete books on or in African languages. The map at the end of the volume is not very accurate for West Africa, where Popo, Susu, Jolof and Mandingo are not in the proper place. Roman Catholic publications have been rather ignored. On p. 4 one is surprised to see only one Ethiopic grammar mentioned (and that in Amharic). We think that the grammars of Bezold, Dillmann, Chaine, Mercer would be more useful for a beginner. On p. 114 Gu is wrongly declared to be spoken by 10,000 people only. On p. 118 Bambara is wrongly listed as a dialect of Jolof and on p. 120 it occurs again under Mandingo, where it should of course be; in that case the number of 100,000 speaking that language (p. 119) is too small, and the district (Gambia) too limited. The section on Hausa (p. 115) is not very clear; the Hausa Grammar (German) given without author's name is Mischlich's *Lehrbuch der hausa-Sprache*. Haywood's English Hausa Vocabulary 1907 should also be given. The list of reference books should include the lists by Starr and by Ida Pratt. The authors entirely forgot the Berber (or Kabyle) except the Shilha dialect on which there is a very important literature, which has been very ably listed in the periodical *Rapports sur les études berbères et haoussa* of the scholarly R. Basset. In spite of these defects this catalogue will be very useful and answers to a real need. In 1904, M. Delafosse wrote in his *Vocabulaire comparé de plus de soixante langues* "As a matter of principle I did not include any Bible translation,

primer, or prayer book . . . these translations have no value whatever from the point of view of the study of negro languages and are regularly meaningless for the natives." From the reviewer's experience, this is almost always true of first translations, but not of their revised form. More thorough study of African languages, such as this book will certainly further, will help to remove this incubus even from the first editions.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Al-Mashra'. By P. Sbath. Cairo, Rue Sabri 12. Pp. 210.

This is a charming apology for Christianity written in Arabic by a Roman Catholic missionary. He tells us that his books are the result of addresses and conversations which took place in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine. The author does not depart from the rules of eastern politeness. He handles Arabic with elegance. He quotes the Koran appropriately and the Christian scriptures lavishly. His references to western works are usually not of the kind that would satisfy us to-day. This may be partly our fault. We are living in a world of too many books and easily fall victim to critical snobbery. The religious tone is sustained throughout without bitterness and the apocalyptic flavor of the last chapter gives to the book the best kind of an ending.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

A Practical Sanscrit Dictionary. By Arthur Anthony MacDonell. New York: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Dr. A. A. MacDonell is already so well known in the field of Sanscrit literature and philology that anything from his pen is sure to be welcomed. Moreover, in the brief but honorable list of Sanscrit lexicographers, whose work, commencing with the Dictionary of H. H. Wilson, prepared the way for the great Thesaurus of Böhtlingk and Roth, and for the later achievements of Monier-Williams, Benfey and Cappeller, Dr. MacDonell has already won a place. Yet every fresh effort shows some sign of larger knowledge and more accurate judgment.

The present dictionary not only avails itself of all the earlier attempts but also aims to be something more than a re-issue of the author's former lexicon published by Messrs. Longmans and

Green. That there are very manifest improvements is suggested first by the Preface and then confirmed by an examination of the text. In the mere matter of copiousness, though a considerable number of terms used only by native lexicographers are excluded because of their non-appearance in general literature, the present dictionary contains about double the material as compared with other works of the kind. The vocabulary goes far enough back to include most of the Vedic Hymns, and comes down far enough to our own day to take in most of what is known as classical literature. Space is even found for many of the technical terms employed in law, grammar, philosophy and rhetoric, provided these are terms needed to be understood by the general reader. One misses, however, some of the obsolete roots which, though not essential to a "practical" dictionary are valuable to the philologist.

The words are given not only in the Devanāgarī character but also in transliteration, though, in the present writer's opinion it is unfortunate that the system employed is that of the "Sacred Books of the East," where italics are used to denote certain letters. This is difficult for the transcriber and awkward for the reader. For example, to use "g" (in italics) as equivalent to a "j" is clumsy, and the ordinary reader finds difficulty in realising that "agyāni" must be pronounced "ajyāni." Similarly, to make "k" (in italics) = "ch" is to put a stumbling block in the path of the English reader. It would, in the writer's opinion, have been far better to use the system of transliteration recommended by the Royal Asiatic Society. One excellent feature of the "Practical Dictionary" is the printing of all the Sanscrit roots in large-type Devanāgarī in such a way that the derivative forms are easily collected. This reference back of all derivatives to the root gives an etymological value to the dictionary which many of its predecessors have sadly lacked.

A further feature which deserves praise is the ascription, where possible, of the word to its proper period. This is particularly the case with words from the Vedic.

Altogether the new Dictionary well deserves the qualifying adjective on the title-page, namely, "Practical," and students will appreciate it accordingly. It needs hardly be said that the Oxford University Press has done its part of the work with its accustomed

excellence, and the number of *corrigenda*, for this particular type of work, is astonishingly small.

HERBERT H. GOWEN

Esquisse d'une histoire de la philosophie indienne. By T. Masson-Oursel. Paris: Geuthner, 1923, pp. 315.

This is a doctor's thesis which does great honor to the writer and his teachers Sylvain Lévi and A. Foucher. We do not know of any subject more difficult than the one studied by Dr. Masson-Oursel; but the author was singularly qualified, both as philosopher and as a philologist. That means, by the way, that he is not only an Indianist but knows also the Tibetan and Chinese sources, which are most important for checking up chronological sequences. In the field of Indianism, there are many pitfalls: overcriticism, or lack of critical sense, a tendency to simplify too much, or to be too eclectic, an undue emphasis on the influence of popular religion, or on the speculation of the élite. Dr. Masson-Oursel seems to have avoided all these dangers, and a few others. In India, far more than in Europe, religion and philosophy are clearly connected because both aim at *moksha*, deliverance. Dogmas become philosophies and philosophical systems create churches. Hence Indian philosophy is collective rather than individual. Systems are not successive but correlated. Nothing dies and one cannot tell exactly when anything new begins. Professor Masson-Oursel studies successively Vedic thought, prebuddhistic Brahmanism, Jainism, Buddhism, the sectarian cults and Neobrahmanism (or the new brahmanical synthesis), Mahayana Buddhism, the six orthodox systems, the great commentators, the heterodox systems, Hinduism, and western influences. The quality of the work is excellent throughout, the treatment of Buddhism being especially remarkable, and perhaps startling for those who have learned to see Buddhism through the Pali canon. Some of the most important contributions are found in the notes, as for instance n. 40 p. 270 on the evolution of the doctrine of Nirvana, the best short statement we can remember. The following note on the dialectic of Siddartha is also excellent. The book is full of such enlightening paragraphs. The bibliographical apparatus is fairly complete, although it might have been brought up to date here and there (for instance note 153 does not mention Woodward and Mattingly's

edition of *Barlaam and Iosaph*, 1914, which is now standard; nor does it refer to Edmunds, *Buddhist and Christian gospels*, the fourth edition of which is especially valuable. Note 154 does not refer to Farquhar's excellent book on *Modern religious movements in India*. Edmunds' Buddhist bibliography in JTPS 1902 was also overlooked. P. 267 l. 32 read Bigandet. Dr. Masson-Oursel thinks that the Aryans came from the Danube, a theory which he declares to be, to some extent, corroborated by the now well known Indian names of some gods of Mitanni (p. 18). We fail to see why these names at all imply a Danubian relation rather than an Iranian origin. The whole question of Asianic origins is now open; it may possibly be much nearer a solution when the Hittite sources have been properly studied. So far the discussions on the original home of the Aryans have been rather dilettante, and the arguments presented for a Hungarian origin of the Aryans are unconvincing.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Vaishnava Lyrics done into English Verse. By Surendranath Kumar, Nandalal Datta, and John Alexander Chapman. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923, pp. 74. \$ 1.85.

The translations of Maithali and Bengali poems given in that book were first made into English prose by two Hindu scholars and then excellently done into verse by Mr. Chapman. A very useful glossary explains Hindu terms unfamiliar to the average reader. These love songs about Radha have a great value for those who want to know something of the real content of the Indian religious consciousness, often veiled to us by scholarly books on Vedism. They also reveal to us something of the Indian psychology of love, a subject of which westerners can at best have very little knowledge. We do not know whether Mr. Chapman's preface and his prologue are too imaginative or not—but they sound true to us, as true as Indian miniature.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

Modern Religious Movements in India. By J. N. Farquhar. 2nd edition. Toronto: Macmillan, 1924, pp. 486. \$ 3.00.

When Dr. Farquhar's book was published in 1915, it was hailed as a masterful treatment of modern religious life in India.

The second edition is now published without any changes that we can notice. We question whether it would not have been fairer to the author's good name to have corrected some statements which are no longer exact. The space given to the Anthroposophical Society (p. 276) is too short. The development of Mazdaznan in California should have been noticed (p. 347). The activity of Semi-Yogism in America should also have been mentioned as well as the Sufist activities of Inayat-Khan. On p. 148, the English translation of the Koran by Mohammed Ali (of which there is now a second edition) is still given as a project. Mr. Kamal-ud-Din's differences with the orthodox branch should have been mentioned, as well as the work being carried on by the Ahmadiyyas of Qadian among the low caste of India. Mr. Farquhar's work is still of fundamental value, but one should not forget that it is ten years old.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

The Lay of Alha, a Saga of Rajput Chivalry as sung by Minstrels of Northern India, partly translated . . . by . . . William Waterfield . . . with an Introduction and abstracts of the Untranslated Portions by Sir George Grierson. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1923, pp. 278. \$ 2.50.

The Alh-khand or "Lay of Alha" is the most popular poem of its kind in Northern India. It is transmitted orally from generation to generation of minstrels. The recensions vary therefore according to places, and the original Hindi poem has been so modernized that there is probably little of its twelfth century author. Its theme is connected with the rivalry between Kanauj and Delhi, but is concerned mostly with the kingdom of Mahoba. There the memory of the fair Banaphar heroes is still preserved and a clan claims them as ancestors. These Banaphars were not of pure Rajput origin, and slurs upon their pedigree caused much fighting. For the student of ethnology the lay of Alha is especially interesting in his description of the marriage customs of Rajput princes, and the extraordinary battles, and even the treachery attending them. On two occasions the hero Udan refuses to countenance a secret marriage because it would be unaccompanied by bloodshed. The battles described are terrible, both numbers and casualties are very large. In one conflict an army of 1,100,000 men

loses 500,000 killed, and many wounded besides! No wonder that when troops are mobilized, the general says, somewhat like Gideon,

Now he who loves his child the least,
Let him go and take his pay;
And he whose wife is the darlingest,
Let him down his weapons lay.

Heroes who have been beheaded in battle, still keep on fighting, until someone threw over them a banner of blue, which caused them to fall at last. There are of course in the poem many repetitions which the translator wisely left out, imperfect chronological data, and anachronisms without number. Mr. Waterfield used in his translation the English Ballad Metre, which gives to it a very suitably medieval touch. There are good notes, a list of the persons taking part in the story, and a map of the country where the seven heroes of Mahoba performed their prowesses. With these helps it is easy to follow the story and to enjoy its charm. There is no better introduction to Rajput knighthood.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

History of British India under the Company and the Crown.
By P. E. Roberts. New York: Oxford University Press, 1923,
pp. 632. \$ 4.20.

This is a new edition in one volume of vol. 7 of the *Historical Geography of the Dominions*, edited by Sir Charles Lucas. A short chapter outlines the physical and geographical features of India, another is a sketch of political history of that country before the coming of the British. The first part ends with the abolition of the East India Company, the second with post-war political conditions and the Montague-Chelmsford Report. Mr. Roberts deals only with political history, and that means of course mostly wars, and to some extent, administrative matters. The author is exceedingly fair. He admits that "the abstract rights of semi-civilized countries receive scant recognition when great colonizing powers converge upon them." His work is not, however, a complete picture of Indian history. It refers nowhere to missionary activity which certainly has had a great influence on India. Social

development is scarcely hinted at. The new industrialism is practically ignored. The book should have been entitled a *History of British administration in India*. Then it would have been declared excellent without qualifications. We must of course not expect to find in it much interest in the recent upheaval of the Orient.

JOHN A. MAYNARD

The Home of an Eastern Clan. By Mrs. Leslie Milne. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch, pp. 419. \$ 5.35.

This is a charming and detailed study of the Palaung people of northeast Burma by the author of *Shans at Home*, and of *An Elementary Palaung Grammar*. Mrs. Milne has studied the Palaungs in their native hills, mastering their language and living among them for months at a time. The result is a volume which will not only hold the general reader, but will be of value to the anthropologist as well.

DUDLEY TYNG

Les Races du Haut-Tonkin de Phong-Tho à Lang-Son. By Maurice Abadie. Paris: Société d'Éditions Géographiques, Maritimes, et Coloniales, 1924.

Colonel Abadie is one of many French military and administrative officers who have enlarged our knowledge of the manners, customs, and languages of the tribes of Tonkin. This description of the three tribes in the hills of Cochin-China near the borders of China proper contains a mass of information which sheds light on various phases of Chinese antiquity as well as on the immediate subject-matter itself. The dry and somewhat disappointed exposition is compensated by over a hundred excellent photographs. M. Pelliot contributes an appreciative preface.

DUDLEY TYNG

Early Buddhist Monachism. By Sukumar Dutt. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1924, pp. 177. \$ 4.50.

This is an interesting and useful study in the comparatively neglected field of the development of early Buddhist monachism. In the almost total absence of definite chronology the author seeks

to reconstruct the sequence of development from the mass of materials in the Vinaya Pitaka and other Pali works. Of the seven chapters of the book, the introductory chapter, chapter II on the primitive Paribrājakas, chapter III on the nature and growth of the Patimokkha, and chapter V on the growth of the Buddhist coenobium are particularly useful.

DUDLEY TYNG